

282045

JPRS-TAC-86-066

20 AUGUST 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 114

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8
105
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

20 AUGUST 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Moscow Assails Japanese Decision on SDI Participation (Moscow Television Service, 22 Jul 86; Moscow in Japanese, 22 Jul 86).....	1
Impact of Election, by Valeriy Korzin	1
S&T, Economic Effects	2
Moscow Reports on Recent Reagan SDI Comments (Moscow Television Service, 17 Jul 86; Moscow TASS, 30 Jul 86).....	4
Radio Address, by Valentin Zorin	4
Speech to Republican Students	4
TASS Cites Kampelman, Abrahamson on Continuation of SDI (Moscow TASS, 24 Jul 86).....	6
USSR Claims U.S. Plans SDI Role for Diego Garcia (Baku International Service, 22 Jul 86).....	7
TASS Reports on Contractors Working on SDI (Moscow TASS, 12, 24 Jul 86).....	8
FRG Companies	8
California, Texas Companies	8
Soviet Military Journal Condemns SDI (M. Aleksandrov; AVIATSIYA I KOSMONAVTIKA, No 3, Mar 86).....	10

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR's Kolesnichenko on U.S. Arms Stance, Political Scene (Tomas Kolesnichenko; Moscow Television Service, 27 Jul 86, Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Jul 86).....	14
Ponders Response to Proposals	14
Notes U.S. 'Barometer'	15

SALT/START ISSUES

Finland's Leading Paper on Latest Gorbachev SALT Proposals (Editorial; Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 3 Jul 86).....	16
--	----

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: Reports, Comments on U.S. Binary Arms Decision (Moscow TASS, 29, 30 Jul 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 30 Jul 86).....	18
Speakes Announcement	18
Reagan Sends Message to Congress, by Nikolay Turkatenko	18
NATO 'Unity' Scored, by Vladimir Chernyshev	19
Military-Industrial Complex Blamed, by Sergey Pravdin	20
New Chemical Weapons Control Proposal From Finland (Tapani Vaananen; Helsinki UUSI SUOMI, 25 Jun 86).....	22

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS Reports on U.S.-Soviet Test Ban Talks (Moscow TASS, 25 Jul 86; Moscow TASS International Service, 27 Jul 86).....	24
Talks Open	24
'Cornucopia' Test Noted, by Yuri Kornilov	24
Moscow Press Conference of Scientists Against Nuclear Tests (Moscow TASS International Service, 14 Jul 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 14 Jul 86).....	26
TASS Report	26
Velikhov Comments	27
TASS: World's Scientists Discuss Nuclear Test Monitoring (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 15 Jul 86).....	30
U.S. Scientists in Kazakhstan Detect Test in Nevada (G. Dildyayev; Moscow PRAVDA, 19 Jul 86).....	32

TASS: Results of Joint Monitoring Experiment Discussed (Moscow TASS, 29 Jul 86).....	34
Soviet Paper Interviews FRG Seismologist on Verification (Hans-Peter (Kharyes) Interview; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27 Jul 86).	35
USSR: U.S. 'Cornucopia' Test in Nevada Assailed (Various sources, 24-26 Jul 86).....	37
TASS Report	37
Worldwide Demands for Test Ban, by Aleksandr Serikov, et al.	38
Detected in Kazakhstan, by G. Dildyayev	39
Details of Test Outlined, by G. Vasilyev	40
USSR's Velikhov: Test Ban Necessary, Verifiable (Ye.P. Velikhov Interview; Moscow PRAVDA, 24 Jul 86).....	42
IZVESTIYA Editorial on Nuclear Test Ban Issues (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 31 Jul 86).....	45
Soviet Reports on Philippine Discussion Over U.S. Bases (Moscow World Service, 24 Jul 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 17 Jul 86)...	49
Constitution's View Assessed, by Nikolay Kuzin	49
TV Debate Noted, by L. Kuznetsov	50
IZVESTIYA Commentary Lauds DPRK Proposal for Korean NFZ (B. Vinogradov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27 Jun 86).....	52
Finland in New Effort To Revive Nordic Nuclear Free Zone (Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 11 Jul 86).....	54

RELATED ISSUES

Gorbachev Vladivostok Speech: Asian Security, Reagan NST Letter (Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev; Moscow Television Service, 28 Jul 86).....	56
USSR: Initial Commentaries on Gorbachev Vladivostok Speech (Various sources, various dates).....	65
Foreign Ministry Press Briefing	65
West European Response, by Vladimir Tsvetov	66
Threat of 'Nuclear Catastrophe', by Aleksandr Yevdokimov	67
Asian Nuclear Deployments, by Askold Biryukov	67
Soviet Asia-Pacific Role, by Anatoliy Krasikov	68
Asian CSCE Urged, by G. Kim	71
USSR's Petrovskiy on Soviet International Security Policies (V. Petrovskiy; Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 6, Jun 86).....	73

Reports, Commentary on Visit to Moscow by FRG's Genscher (Various sources, various dates).....	85
Meets Nitze Before Leaving	85
Arms Talks Highlighted, by Viktor Levin	85
Meeting With Gorbachev	85
DPA on Gorbachev Meeting	87
Lists Main Topics	87
Genscher Begins Shevardnadze Talks	88
CW Accord Seen 'Shortly'	88
Genscher Views Relations, Hans-Dietrich Genscher Interview	88
Meetings With Shevardnadze	89
Genscher Press Conference	90
Discusses Disarmament	91
Shevardnadze, Genscher Dinner Speeches	92
DPA Reports Genscher Speech	96
Politburo Discusses Visit	97
Commentary on Visit, by Igor Surguchev	97
Genscher's U.S. Visit, by Aleksandr Zholkver	98
FRG CP Aide Comments	99

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ASSAILS JAPANESE DECISION ON SDI PARTICIPATION

Impact of Election

OW241315 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 22 Jul 86

[From the "World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] As you know, comrades, the Liberal Democratic Party managed to obtain the majority of votes at the recent Japanese elections. An extraordinary session of the Japanese parliament opened in Tokyo today. It is being held for the first time since the elections.

Yasuhiro Nakasone was reelected prime minister by the Lower House. Until recently he spoke very discreetly about Japan's participation in the "star wars" program, and that can be explained. On the eve of the elections, the prime minister could not ignore the strong antinuclear and antiwar mood in the country of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Now his hands are free, and many observers think that the country of the rising sun will be moving much more quickly along the road of rapprochement with the U.S. military-industrial complex, along the road of Japan's inclusion in the SDI program. All the more so as Nakasone is actually an SDI supporter, though publicly he maintains a very careful position with regard to it. A few days ago, the newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES, quoting a highly placed representative of the Japanese Government, reported that, in principle, Tokyo had already made a decision concerning participation in the Star Wars program.

U.S. officials also play a kind of double game. On the one hand, they stress in every way that Japan's participation is of no decisive significance for achieving success in SDI research. On the other hand, they hope very much to lay their hands on the latest Japanese technology in the field of electronics, laser equipment, and rocket engines.

Some estimates indicate that the Japanese contractors' share will amount to almost 15 percent of all star wars allocations in the next 5 years. That will come to almost \$26 billion. So you see, the Japanese, like the British, are being lured with billions of dollars. Time will tell whether these forecasts will come true and whether these \$26 billion will be in the pockets of Japanese entrepreneurs. But it can be said now that many of those who formerly reacted coolly to the U.S. proposals have lately begun to bite ever more actively at this bait, this \$26 billion, and to change their attitude toward SDI.

In this respect, the question arises as to what will happen to the special resolution adopted by the Japanese parliament in 1969. This resolution commits Japan to take

part only in the peaceful utilization of space. Some quarters in Japan would like to forget about it, but the Japanese people remember it. Antiwar demonstrations are being held throughout the country. The anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedies will be marked on 6 August. Now, as official Tokyo, under pressure from Washington, is moving more and more onto the road of militarization, the residents of the Japanese islands understand that they must not remain indifferent, that they must struggle. They must struggle for the destiny of the country, the destiny of the world.

S&T, Economic Effects

OW250257 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Excerpts] Listeners, on 18 July, Japan's six major cabinet members made a decision in favor of Japanese participation in the U.S. space militarization program. In this connection, Radio Moscow commentator Afonin writes:

By simply saying that it understands SDI, that is, the Strategic Defense Initiative, the Japanese Government has delayed a decision of Japan's participation in SDI for the past 1 and 1/2 years. This obviously two-faced attitude on the evidently military-oriented scheme of the Pentagon, or the U.S. Defense Department, stemmed from the government's unstable position as a result of a narrow majority the LDP maintained in the Diet through a tie-up with the New Liberal Club. Following the big victory in the recent general election, the government appears to feel that it no longer needs to consider how the opposition parties will react. [passage omitted]

In general SDI supporters in Japan mostly maintain that Japan's participation in the space militarization program will have favorable effects on the progress of its science and technology. Some say that if Japan refuses to meet U.S. requests on the star wars scheme, it will fall behind in the field of new technology. Is this really true?

Japan's science and industry have thus far made practical achievements by pursuing peaceful development. Mankind has repeatedly paid a large price by allowing their academic and ideological achievements to be used for developing new destructive devices. SDI gives us an important chance to review profound lessons of history. It is said that research within the framework of the star wars plan will effect a secondary outcome, or what is called the spin-off, which can be used for peaceful purposes. However, this is quite doubtful. According to an expert's impartial view, this research is too specific to produce the said outcome. In general, a plan for a new consumer good cannot be justified if it is carried out at the price of promoting the threat of war. It is like burning the entire house to fry an egg.

From a scientific viewpoint, space militarization is feared to have a very negative effect on Japan. Scholars and experts will move from the peaceful domain to the military field. In addition, they will move from Japan to the United States as money comes from the Pentagon. This will expedite dependence of Japan's scientific thinking to the U.S. military industrial complex.

In this connection, it is very significant that some business leaders in Japan have doubts about SDI. Their doubts began with the U.S. request that SDI research be conducted in strict secrecy. Major Japanese newspapers noted this when they reported on the decision of the major cabinet members on 18 July. This leads us to conclude that it will be either impossible or at least very difficult for Japan to use any SDI research results.

There is no consensus on Japan's participation in the star wars plan, even among Japanese financial leaders. However, it is true that Japanese financial circles are more interested in profits from U.S. orders than in scientific progress, the prospect of which is very doubtful. The Pentagon has promised to extend formidable amounts of money to win the consent of industrial circles in allied nations. For example, it promised Britain \$1 billion, but it has actually disbursed one-seventieth of that amount. However, the agreement has already been signed. The U.S. side has achieved its purpose. According to UK newspapers, the British side appears to be regretting its signing, though belatedly.

To sum up, it is total nonsense from not only the scientific and technological but also the economic viewpoints to talk about merits of SDI participation despite broad propaganda for it.

Militarily, its merits are out of the question. Space militarization presupposes a nuclear war where nuclear arms are used. Such a war will take not only Japan but also all mankind to the verge of total destruction, and any strategic defense will be useless.

Politically, Japan seems to view its participation in SDI as a new demonstration of its loyalty to the United States. However, this gesture will lead Japan into paying too high a price, will it not? Japanese politicians are well aware that SDI is a nuclear program. They also know that SDI is an aggressive plan designed to strengthen U.S. offensive nuclear war capabilities. [passage omitted]

There is no doubt that the Star Wars plan contains not only military but also economic and political aspects. However, as a whole, it is a nuclear military scheme designed to establish military supremacy over the Soviet Union. This is undoubtedly the central task of SDI. All these features of space militarization are complexly intertwined. It is absolutely impossible to separate them. It is also utterly impossible to support some of the other features. Therefore, whatever reasons the Japanese Government cites for its support of space militarization, it is actually working to offer advantages to those who are interested in promoting nuclear confrontation. The Japanese cabinet members who have given their consent to Japan's participation in SDI are believed to have also expressed, by their consent, their support for stepped-up nuclear armament and the increased threat of war.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1499

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW REPORTS ON RECENT REAGAN SDI COMMENTS

Radio Address

LD171741 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 17 Jul 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpts] Many commentaries in the international press have been stirred by President Reagan's latest radio address. The president devoted this address to proof of the need to implement the "Star Wars" program, which Washington calls the Strategic Defense Initiative--SDI. To be honest, I can't get my tongue round this term because the word defense, which is included in it, is in complete contradiction with the true meaning of Washington's latest military program.

The very fact that Ronald Reagan decided to publicize his program on radio may at first glance give cause for surprise. After all, why should such publicity and such a brainwashing of broad circles of American public opinion be necessary when, through the use of his power, the President has already put it into effect? However, in actual fact, the matter is not all that simple. First, a sizable group of top American physicists oppose the implementation of this program, stating that not only is it fantastically expensive, but also, on the basis of the present level of knowledge and scientific discoveries, virtually unrealistic.

The anxiety of broad circles of the American public over the "Star Wars" program has become so widespread that 46 senators have voiced their opposition to this program--46 out of the 100 members of this supreme house of the American Congress. And, at the same time, it is reported that, if necessary, another 9 or 10 senators could be added to this 46, and thus the government's SDI program could find itself blocked in the Senate.

Speech to Republican Students

LD300848 Moscow TASS in English 0827 GMT 30 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 30 TASS -- Speaking on Tuesday to Republican Party students, U.S. President Reagan confirmed again the administration's intention to speed up the "star wars" programme. He said that the USA did not intend to make this programme a

subject for haggling at Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons. He pointed out that the USA should go on with the SDI programme according to the schedule. Notwithstanding the hard facts, the head of the White House again alleged that the "star wars" programme was an earnest of peace without nuclear weapons. On the other hand, experts point out that systems planned under this programme mean not only laser and other "exotic" weapons but also the latest and more dangerous nuclear weapons to be deployed in outer space.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1499

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS CITES KAMPELMAN, ABRAHAMSON ON CONTINUATION OF SDI

LD241828 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 24 TASS -- In disregard of the demands of American and world public, the U.S. Administration is out to make the process of militarisation irreversible.

In an interview broadcast on the channels of the television network of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) "Worldnet", Max Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, said that the USA would continue research work under the "star wars" programme.

The tragic accident of the reusable space shuttle "Challenger" will lead only to a certain delay, but by no means to cancelling experiments within the framework of the "star wars" programme, Lieutenant-General James Abrahamson, the head of the organization for the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative", said in an interview with the newspaper "DEFENCE NEWS". It was reported in the U.S. press that in the course of the missions of the space ships of that type "indisputable priority" would be given to the delivery into orbit of military payloads, above all those which are to be used in experiments under the SDI programme.

The Pentagon is planning to deploy in outer space hundreds, even thousands of laser weapon units, which are to run on the energy released as a result of a nuclear blast. Professor Ernest Sternglass of Pittsburgh University pointed out in an article in the Bulletin of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. As a result of such an explosion at least a half of the radioactive particles thus formed would penetrate the earth's atmosphere and decrease the protective ozone layer, he stressed. Vast areas of land would be exposed to intensive ultraviolet radiation for an indefinitely long time.

Moreover, the scientist emphasized, the Pentagon is planning to deploy in outer space powerful nuclear reactors as energy sources for weapons systems. Their control and the carrying out of routine work in outer space pose enormous difficulties. In the event of an accident a huge radioactive cloud would go down to the earth's surface.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1499

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR CLAIMS U.S. PLANS SDI ROLE FOR DIEGO GARCIA

GF221710 Baku International Service in Azeri 1200 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Unattributed commentary: "The Indian Ocean Must Be Converted Into a Peace Zone"]

[Excerpt] The UN Special Committee on the Indian Ocean is holding its regular meeting at the UN headquarters in New York. The session agenda also includes matters concerning the convocation of an international conference for realizing the UN declaration for the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a peace zone. The 40th UN General Assembly has assigned the special committee with the task of concluding its preparations during the current year for holding the conference as soon as possible -- at least not later than 1988.

The decision for convening an international conference on the Indian Ocean was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1979. The Soviet Union voted in favor of the resolution in that regard and expressed readiness to participate in the special committee. The United States, Great Britain, France, and a number of other countries in the West abstained at the time of the voting. However, it is true that they later decided to participate in the special committee. Nevertheless, their decision was aimed only at complicating the committee's work. Due to the (?negative) stance of the Western countries headed by the United States, it has not been possible to convene a conference on the Indian Ocean to date.

Washington is making every effort to militarize the Indian Ocean. The network of U.S. military bases in the huge region, which is made up of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, is being broadened and modernized. There are over 30 bases in that region and the reinforcement of the large U.S. base on Diego Garcia -- an island which was forcefully wrested from the Maldives -- is drawing to an end. It has runways capable of accommodating the B-52 and B-1 bomber aircraft and the [word indistinct] aerial refueling tankers. Docks have been built for aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines and large fuel and ammunition depots have been constructed. Nuclear and chemical arms have been stored on that base.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union possesses information that the base of Diego Garcia is being considered for the Star Wars program. Facilities for electronic monitoring of inner space are being built on that island. Military experts estimate that one aspect of the Star Wars program contemplated by the Pentagon is the [words indistinct] of the missiles in U.S. submarines containing nuclear warheads.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1499

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS ON CONTRACTORS WORKING ON SDI

FRG Companies

LD120905 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 12 Jul 86

[Text] Washington, 12 July TASS--It has been announced here that the Pentagon has granted the West German Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm concern a contract worth \$4 million for work under the Reagan "star wars" program. The U.S. Defense Department boastfully described the order as the "biggest contract" to have been concluded with the FRG company in conformity with the memorandum on mutual understanding signed between the USA and the FRG. Under the Pentagon's contract, Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm is to draw up plans to carry out an experiment in the use of infra-red pickups for the detection and ranging from outer space of missiles at the time of their launching. As the AP agency said, the contract would also enable the West German company to gain new contracts in the future for the development of equipment worth a total of \$40 million.

California, Texas Companies

LD241346 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS -- By TASS analyst Yuriy Kornilov: Two figures have surfaced in the American press lately, which cannot but attract close attention. 3.8 billion dollars will be spent in fiscal 1987 on the "star wars" programme (WALL STREET JOURNAL).

According to research workers of the John Hopkins University, the implementation of Ronald Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative would cost the American tax payers at least 770 billion dollars within the next years.

Indeed, these are astronomical sums. Who, what circles in the USA, whose economy, as the American press indicates, is experiencing ever more serious and deep strains are interested in the immense spending on brand new arms systems?

The answer to this question can be found in the pages of FORTUNE magazine, a publication of American big business, which systematically lists 500 major national corporations. According to the magazine, it is the military industrial giants which make up the core of Club-500.

The answer to this question is also provided by THE WASHINGTON POST which enumerates the chief SDI contractors: Teledyne, Boeing, Rockwell, McDonnell-Douglas, Hughes and BDM...

Indicatively, most of the military-industrial concerns, gaining millions on preparations for "star wars", are based in California, where nearly one half of the Pentagon's SDI orders are being implemented.

Many experts and news analysts draw attention in this connection to the fact that California became not only an "arms factory", but also a "politicians factory", for it is in this state that most members of the military-political elite, currently at the helm in Washington, started their careers.

Victor Perlo, a well-known American economist, said that the U.S. President, the defense secretary and the secretary of state all came from California.

Perlo observed that the present administration's extreme aggressiveness and Reagan's stubborn struggle for the complete -- down to the last dollar-- satisfaction of the Pentagon's requests cannot but be linked to the fact that forty billion dollars worth of military orders were placed in 1984 in California -- nearly three times as much as in other states.

Texas, the home of U.S. Vice President George Bush, is second with 14.3 billion dollars worth of Pentagon orders.

No previous administration in the U.S. ever had such apparent and deep connections with the military-industrial complex.

That closes the circle. First, military-industrial giants pave the road for power to be tread by those who are faithful servants of big business, and then they reap the fruits...

/12858

CSO: 5200/1499

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET MILITARY JOURNAL CONDEMNS SDI

Moscow AVIATSIYA I KOSMONAVTIKA in Russian No 3, Mar 86 (signed to press 31 Jan 86) pp 46-47

[Article, published under the heading "Imperialism -- Enemy of Peoples," by M. Aleksandrov: "'Star Warriors' and the 'Business of Death'"; based on materials published in the foreign press]

[Text] Three years ago President Ronald Reagan gave a White House address in which he proposed a so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" program, which allegedly would guarantee protection against nuclear attack. We might recall that from the end of the 1960's up to the beginning of the 1980's the Pentagon's nuclear strategy was grounded on the concept of "assured destruction," which stated that, with both sides possessing thermonuclear stockpiles, U.S. security was ensured by the capability to deter the potential aggressor from employing nuclear weapons with the threat of inflicting damage on a corresponding or greater scale.

According to the NEW YORK TIMES, the total aggregate arsenal of explosives presently possessed by the United States and the USSR amounts to 15 billion tons. Merely 1/165th of this stockpile would be sufficient to destroy life on Earth and turn it into a planet of "nuclear winter." Apparently on the basis of these estimates, the U.S. President declared the former concept a "great evil" and as an alternative proposed the idea of creating a large-scale antimissile defense system employing the latest technology, including space-based weapons. It essentially boils down to building a space "shield," from behind which a first strike can be launched at any moment. This is the true significance of this provocational concept, which the "star warriors" -- the Pentagon generals and political adventurers -- have so tenaciously seized upon.

Thus the date 23 March 1983 in fact became the starting point of the "Star Wars" Program, as Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" has been so aptly dubbed.

The term "Star Wars" has become for all progressive mankind, for all people of common sense throughout the world, a symbol of sinister U.S. intentions to transform space into a new theater of war, concealed behind the at first glance innocent "wrapper" of defense. Even such prominent military experts as

former U.S. secretary of defense Robert McNamara and J. Smith, former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. strategic arms limitation talks, have spoken out in condemnation of the Washington Administration's vaunted "Strategic Defense Initiative." They point out that this program is aimed at shattering the existing military balance between the two countries and at undermining fundamental Soviet-U.S. agreements in the area of arms limitation.

R. Bowman, president of the Institute for Study of the Problems of Space and Security, came out even more emphatically on this score. "The systems being developed under the Star Wars program," he states, "are not purely defensive. They will be positioned in Earth orbit, traveling over the territory of potential adversaries and capable of attacking any object in space and, possibly, even on the territory of other countries."

Three years have passed.... The "star warriors" are summarizing results achieved to date at numerous press conferences and congressional hearings. For example, SDI Director James Abrahamson and Gerold Yonas, chief U.S. scientific expert in the field of antimissile technology, noted with unconcealed satisfaction at a press briefing held last year at the Pentagon that Reagan's strategic initiative is advancing "very nicely," at an even faster pace than anticipated.

Specific SDI research areas in which, according to Abrahamson and Yonas, the greatest success has been achieved, include the development of free-electron laser weapons, high-powered ground-based chemical lasers, rail guns, as well as development of methods of compensating for atmospheric disturbances for laser beams and the development of semiconductor materials which are resistant to the effect of radioactive emissions. It is also reported that the decision has been made to speed up the development of space weapons based on nuclear explosions, that is, X-ray lasers.

Recently U.S. SDI research has increasingly gone beyond the laboratory walls. Last year, for example, the first test of the Miracle high-powered laser was conducted in a setting maximally approximating actual field conditions. A ground-based chemical laser destroyed with its beam the second stage of a Titan I rocket at White Sands Proving Ground in New Mexico.

The Space Shuttle Program will also become increasingly more actively involved in SDI. Last June an Air Forces facility on Maui (Hawaiian Islands) aimed a ground-based laser beam toward the shuttle craft "Discovery," which was subsequently reflected back with a prismatic mirror.

Experiments which, in the words of U.S. experts, were "important for SDI," were conducted at the end of July-beginning of August 1985 during the 19th Space Shuttle mission. On four occasions the crew of the "Challenger" briefly fired up the shuttle craft's maneuvering motors for a brief time (from 25 to 45 seconds) while in a ground radar coverage area. As was noted in the U.S. press, such experiments make it possible to determine the potential effect of plasma on laser and beam systems used both for tracking and attacking space objects. A shuttle mission scheduled for the fall of 1987 is to be utilized specifically for the benefit of the "Star Wars" program, while the Pentagon

intends to earmark an additional 14 launches up to the end of 1990 for this purpose.

Work being conducted by the Pentagon on developing the ASAT antisatellite weapon attack system, based on the F-15 fighter, is also closely linked to SDI. It was tested in January and November 1984, and on 13 September of last year it destroyed a U.S. satellite which had ended its useful life.

As additional information and details are learned, the Reagan "Star Wars" program is increasingly perceived as a creature of the U.S. military-industrial complex, with the aid of which the U.S. "business of death" is linking its hopes for a source of profits of unprecedented scale and a guarantee of its prosperity right up to the next century. The journal NATION noted rather aptly that millions of dollars for research in the area of SDI, the alleged purpose of which is to protect the United States against thermonuclear weapons, are ending up in the pockets of those same corporations which manufacture such weapons.

Supporters of SDI are hastening to create conditions favorable for "Star Wars" and a powerful nucleus of SDI-committed companies, research centers and even universities in order to exert pressure on Congress to appropriate more and more funds to carry out the program. Suffice it to say that in 1985 alone the Pentagon's "star warriors" awarded approximately 1,000 contracts to 260 U.S. companies and laboratories totaling in excess of 1 billion dollars. The biggest "Star Wars" contractors include Boeing, Lockheed, and Rockwell, each of which, according to the figures of the Federation of American Scientists, has been awarded Pentagon contracts totaling 200 million dollars or more.

The appetite of the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex is growing. Congress has already approved 2.7 billion dollars in appropriations for Fiscal Year 1986, while by 1989 the cost of SDI projects will reach 50.8 billion dollars, including other expenditures, and 90 billion dollars by 1994. According to estimates, total expenditures on SDI will run from 500 billion to 1 trillion dollars.

According to the figures of the New York Council on Economic Priorities, in 1984 approximately 5,000 U.S. scientists, engineers and other specialists were employed in SDI projects, while the council projects that by 1987 the total will reach 18,600. The Pentagon's "star warriors" and big capital are endeavoring firmly to "program" SDI, to give the program a directional thrust whereby it will be impossible to bring it to a halt. U.S. arms manufacturers have reached the conclusion that their future lies with the "Star Wars" program.

At the present time SDI is limited for the most part to basic research. In the not too distant future, however, U.S. industry, in the opinion of many experts, will proceed from research to weapons development. And "Star Wars" could require weapons deployment on a scale the likes of which nobody has ever imagined. "If things go as far as deployment, this will be the biggest operation of all time for this industry, considerably exceeding everything that has gone before," stated finance expert (A. Benasuli). Figuratively

speaking, the death-dealing locomotive carrying pushers of the "Star Wars" concept is picking up speed.

Sober-minded people throughout the world realize that the nonexpiring treaty between the USSR and the United States limiting ABM systems, signed in Moscow on 26 May 1972, could be placed in question. And what does the White House think about this?

In recent months Ronald Reagan's arms control advisers have been engaged in a fierce debate over whether the President's proposed "Star Wars" program constitutes a breach of the 1972 treaty. The debate was ended by a statement by recently-retired presidential national security adviser R. MacFarlane, which was later confirmed as official Washington policy: "The development of a new generation of laser and particle-beam weapons is permissible, with only deployment prohibited by the terms of that treaty." Thus this is a policy of preparing the soil for a new interpretation of the ABM Treaty, an interpretation which virtually allows unlimited "tests" and "development" within the framework of the "Star Wars" program. And yet statements made in 1972 by the U.S. delegation at the talks and subsequently repeated by the Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan administrations declared that "testing" and "development" of future ABM systems based on lasers and other nontraditional space-based hardware are restricted by the provisions of the ABM Treaty.

The Soviet Union has stressed repeatedly that the SDI Program, including its so-called research component, constitutes a new, even more dangerous round of the arms race, which will inevitably lead to exacerbation of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Last November CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Comrade M. S. Gorbachev stated bluntly at a press conference in Geneva that the "Star Wars" program not only winds up the arms race another notch but also will end any restraint of this race. If the United States finds the will and resolve to rethink and reevaluate all the pernicious aspects and consequences of the "Star Wars" program, the way will open up for constructive solution to the problems of international security and a cessation of the arms race.

There is hope in the Soviet Union that the final word by the U.S. side has not yet been stated in this regard and that peace-seeking reason will prevail. All people of conscience throughout the world and all progressive mankind have faith in this, for to them peace means life, the further flourishing of society, and faith in the future.

At the same time Comrade M. S. Gorbachev stressed at a get-together with a delegation from a congress of Nobel Prize recipients held at the end of last year that if the United States, in spite of everything, proceeds with the development, testing and deployment of a multilayered antimissile defense, the USSR will find an effective response which is in conformity with our view on the requirements of maintaining the strategic balance and its stability.

COPYRIGHT: "Aviatsiya i kosmonavtika", 1986.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1499

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR'S KOLESNICHENKO ON U.S. ARMS STANCE, POLITICAL SCENE

Ponders Response to Proposals

LD271912 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 27 Jul 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Text] Hello comrades! Summer is in full swing, but snow falls from the American political sky; at least, this is the opinion of the famous observer Mary McGrory. She recently wrote the following in THE WASHINGTON POST: The July snow is falling in Washington because the administration has too many contradictory intentions and opposing ideas. This is about the new signals coming out of Washington these days. They have sort of decided to at last answer the new Soviet proposals. It is said that President Reagan is personally working on a definitive draft answer. So the observers are guessing: Will Washington go down the road of a new approach to the problems of nuclear security this time, or not? Or in other words, will it go its way to meet our proposals that are aimed at liberating the world from nuclear weapons? It is a very important question. Nuclear security on our planet is unthinkable without the elimination of the material basis for a nuclear war and the total elimination of the means for waging it. It is at precisely this that our proposals are aimed.

But how is Washington responding? For the meantime they not only do not wish to move forward but even unthinkingly pull down erected barriers formerly on the path to the arms race. This is how the whole world perceives the White House's decision to renounce observance of the SALT I and SALT II treaties that limited offensive strategic weapons, and their intention to put an end to the operation of the ABM Treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems.

It has now become clear that Reagan and his advisors have manifestly underestimated the reaction to this kind of step, both from their allies and from Americans themselves. As recently as last week numerous antiwar organizations -- the representatives of one such women's organizations, by the way, visited Moscow -- demanded that Washington listen to the voice of reason -- to the Soviet proposals. This time, something very important, happened they were supported in the U.S. Congress. The needle on the barometer quivered: Maybe the snow is melting. We would like to believe this in any case. It will become clear in the coming days whether Washington is maneuvering or really going down the road of talks.

The White House's special envoys, Nitze and Rowney, are in the capitals of the countries allied to the United States: they are, so to speak, having consultations there. But this is what puts you on guard: Washington has before, you know, sort of asked the opinion of its allies: How would it be for the United States to renounce observance of SALT II, should they continue nuclear tests?

But what is the results? Nothing! There were no consultations, rather a one-goal game. Because its allies said nothing, Washington continued on its own. It will not be like that this time around; in any case, last week a regular nuclear explosion was carried out in the state of Nevada.

Notes U.S. 'Barometer'

PM250925 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Tomas Kolesnichenko "Commentator's Column": "What Does the Barometer Say?"]

[Text] In recent days many observers have noted that the needle on the political barometer in Washington has at least quivered and begun to move. It is a question of the Reagan administration's attempts to elaborate a "new approach" to the most important problem of today -- arms control and the elimination of the threat of nuclear disaster. Specifically, public attention has been focused on the administration's attitude to the latest Soviet initiatives.

As yet, as is well-known, Washington has not given a positive response to the Soviet proposals. But will the American captial be able to preserve its "figure of silence" for much longer? By all appearances, no. Here is why. The administration's statement that it intends to stop observing very important Soviet-American accords -- the Treaty Limiting Antiballistic Missile Systems (ABM), the Interim Agreement on Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT I), and the treaty on Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT II) -- caused (and the White House did not expect this) a mass protest not only among the U.S. allies, but in America itself. Moreover, against this background official Washington's unseemly position on the question of nuclear tests and at the Geneva talks was revealed particularly clearly. The unpopularity of this position is reflected in all the public opinion polls.

Moreover, the White House's relations with Congress, which can no longer fail to take into account the mood of the American public, have become more difficult. For the first time during Reagan's presidency, very important militarist programs were threatened in congress. Thus the Amercian press recalls that "a shark of a bill is swimming in the waters of the House of Representatives." The bill provides, under certain conditions, for a freeze on funds for the continuation of nuclear tests. The prospects of Congress' extending the ban on testing the ASAT antisatellite system are very real. Financial restrictions on other SDI systems are also possible.

That was why the barometer needle quivered. But it has not yet moved to "clear." The administration's position remains an enigma even to the most experienced observers. THE NEW YORK TIMES, assessing the latest signals from the White House, writes "What is this, a smokescreen designed to mislead? The world will soon find out." And the well-known observer McGrory believes, in general, that snow is falling in Washington," she writes, "because the administration has too many contradictory intentions and opposing goals."

So where will the barometer needle go? The question remains open. One this is clear: The Soviet proposals, which are based on the principles of identical security for the two sides, open up a real path to Soviet-American accords. The attainment of such accords would meet the interests not only of the USSR and the United States, but of the states of the entire world.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1491

SALT/START ISSUES

FINLAND'S LEADING PAPER ON LATEST GORBACHEV SALT PROPOSALS

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 3 Jul 86 p 2

[Editorial: "Upstairs Downstairs Talk"]

[Text] Within the past few weeks, the superpowers have been involved in exceptionally busy correspondence. Both Party Leader Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan have been sending letters and receiving them. Their ministers and advisors have revealed a readers' digest of the contents, but the letters have not been published in full. Therefore, the international public is free to decide on its own which of the suggested offers it believes in and which it considers just plain propaganda.

The most recent offer from Moscow is the announcement on Tuesday by Vladimir Petrovski, assistant minister of foreign affairs, that the Soviet Union has officially proposed the initiation of the preparations for the foreign ministers' meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz. It is an answer to President Reagan's letter, sent on the first of June to Party Leader Gorbachev, in which Reagan proposed a foreign ministers' meeting for preparing for the summit. According to the Americans, Moscow, however, has not sent the offer to Washington; it has only been made in a public press conference.

As if to further deepen the uncertainty, Petrovski completely ignored giving the date of the foreign ministers' meeting. According to him, the time is irrelevant as long as the subjects of the discussions are appropriate. The proposed subjects are a complete ban on nuclear testing and a new approach to the three areas of the arms limitation negotiations in Geneva.

In Poland's party congress on Monday, Gorbachev accused the United States of sabotaging world peace and of pressing western Europe to speed up armament. When speaking to workers in a factory in Warsaw on Tuesday, he told them that he had made a new proposal to the United States, which would break through the impasse of arms negotiations. However, he did not reveal details of the offer or discuss the necessity of summit preparations. The Party Leader's appearances in Poland, which served various purposes, hardly contributed to furthering the issue. They did not

contribute to increasing the amount of information, even though there are more opinions based on prejudices than before.

The Soviet Union's offers in the area of arms limitations comprise the proposal for a meeting of the permanent special commission of the two countries, in Geneva in July, on the Salt II agreement, which the United States has stated it will no longer honor. Since the ABM agreement was made in 1972, the commission has met annually to observe the implementation of the agreements, the alleged violations and their redress. The proposal for an earlier date of the meeting is clearly logical, if the purpose of the Soviet Union is to find means for continuous compliance with the rules of the Salt II agreement. However, accurate information on this has not been released.

In its current form, the correspondence on the superpower level confuses international opinion, since the real status of the negotiations and the content of the proposals are not revealed in the extracts published. While observing the daily changing stream of news, it is hardly remembered that, in their meeting in Geneva last November, Reagan and Gorbachev agreed on two new summits. The first of them was agreed to be held in the United States this year, and the second in the Soviet Union next year. The meetings were agreed on unconditionally.

It is quite obvious that, in the shadow of the public fireworks, within in the invisible shelter of the diplomatic channels, arms, the schedule of the foreign ministers' meeting and the summit are being discussed. It is one of the traditional privileges of the superpowers that detailed information and calculations about the true intentions are not spread in public. The ability to reciprocally offer controlled surprises to the world still greatly pleases the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Cartoon] Would you pass the salt... Of course!

The destiny of the Salt agreement is at stake as part of the tug-of-war between the two leading superpowers.

12956

CSO: 5200/2700

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON U.S. BINARY ARMS DECISION

Speakes Announcement

LD291636 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 29 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 29 TASS -- The U.S. Administration has made the decision to start the production of the latest chemical weapons, binary ammunition. Spokesman for the White House Larry Speakes announced this today. He said that the Pentagon jointly with the NATO Forces Command in Europe had been instructed to work out the plans for the deployment of that ammunition in West European countries under "appropriate circumstances".

Announcing these new dangerous militaristic steps, the spokesman for the White House hypocritically asserted that the conclusion of a verifiable agreement on chemical weapons ban remains the chief priority for the administration.

Reagan Sends Message to Congress

LD301112 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT 30 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 30 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko

President Ronald Reagan on Tuesday sent a special message to Congress on the question of modernizing the U.S. arsenal of chemical weapons.

The message said that the NATO Defence Planning Committee had approved the "force goal" for the production of binary munitions by the U.S., and that the administration, jointly with the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, had developed a plan under which U.S. binary chemical munitions could be deployed in Europe "under appropriate contingency plans". The message also said that the U.S. had "consulted" with other member nations of the North Atlantic alliance on this question.

Although the U.S. unilaterally broke off talks on banning chemical weapons, the President's message claimed that achieving a comprehensive and verifiable ban on all chemical weapons remained the administration's top priority, and that it was "earnestly seeking" to achieve this.

Explaining Reagan's message to Congress, a White House spokesman said that it referred to the binary munitions full-scale production of which would be started in 1988.

According to information, out here, Congress set aside 1.1 billion dollars for the production of chemical weapons in fiscal 1986. 124.5 million dollars out of the sum was earmarked for binary munitions production.

In pressing Congress into allocating more funds for the development and production of ever new types of chemical weapons, the administration claims that the existing stockpiles are "insufficient" and "outdated". According to press reports, however, more than 150,000 tons of toxic substances are stored on U.S. territory and 55,000 tons more are in Western Europe.

The American President's message was presented in such a way so as to show congressmen that all other NATO member countries fully agreed with the American programme of escalating the chemical weapons race.

Dante Fascell, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, pointed out in a statement, released on Tuesday, that this did not correspond to the reality.

Fascell said that participants in the recent meeting of the NATO Council in Halifax, Canada, did not even examine the question of binary munitions. Moreover, they favoured the conclusion of a treaty banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

NATO 'Unity' Scored

LD301329 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 30 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 30 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

Disturbing news is coming from Washington: President Ronald Reagan has sent a message to Congress on the production of binary chemical munitions, a new type of weapons of mass annihilation, in the United States. Earlier on, U.S. Congress, in stating its consent for the allocation of funds for the production of binary munitions, attached the condition that the other NATO member countries should not object to their deployment on their territory in "critical" situations.

The American President's message was presented in such a way so as to show congressmen that all the other NATO member countries fully agreed with the American programme of escalating the chemical weapons race.

Dante Fascell, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, pointed out in a statement that this did not correspond to the reality. Fascell said that participants in the recent meeting of the NATO Council in Halifax, Canada, did not even examine the question of binary munitions. Moreover, they favoured the conclusion of a treaty banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Greece and Luxembourg expressed their reservations and objections to the American plans during the meetings of NATO governing bodies, held in Evere, Belgium, in May. Iceland, which did not take part in the meetings, expressed its negative attitude to the U.S. plans through its permanent representative at NATO. There is an apparent discrepancy between that and Washington's references to alleged consensus.

Washington's decisions in favour of binary munitions are designed not only to preserve, but also to enhance the chemical threat to all of mankind. They contradict the aim of eliminating chemical weapons, cannot but seriously disrupt the process of coordinating the convention on banning such weapons currently under way at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva. The U.S. Administration's actions directly contradict the Soviet-American accords reached at the summit meeting in Geneva, which expressed the aspiration towards a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons and the destruction of all their stockpiles, and stated the inadmissibility of the proliferation of such weapons.

The binary chemical munitions held out particularly dire consequences for Europe, saturated as it is with deadly weapons of all types and varieties. There is only one step from the beginning of binary weapons production in the U.S. to their actual deployment on the territories of West European NATO member countries.

Any assurances that the U.S. would deploy these weapons abroad only in "contingency" and with prior "agreement" of the host government, which would purportedly have "the right of veto", are designed to delude the public. The West German magazine DER SPIEGEL reported in May, this year, that the American military already worked out detailed plans on the transportation of the new types of chemical weapons to Europe.

The decision to use them will be taken by the U.S. President, and the Europeans will have no right of veto on this question. The Soviet Union repeatedly denounced the plans of U.S. and NATO chemical rearmament, drawing the attention of the governments of the U.S. and other member nations of the North Atlantic alliance to the extreme danger of these plans for the cause of peace in Europe and throughout the world. The USSR advanced concrete realistic proposals which make it possible to eliminate all chemical arsenals and the industrial base for their production by the turn of the century. People around the world should say "no" to binary and other chemical weapons. Reason should triumph over insanity.

Military-Industrial Complex Blamed

LD301933 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 30 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary; from the "International Diary" program presented by Sergey Pravdin]

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Another dispatch from Washington says that an official White House spokesman has announced that President Reagan has sent Congress a report providing information on the decision to begin production of a new kind of chemical weapons: so-called binary weapons. I will ask political observer Aleksandr Zholkver to comment on this decision.

[Zholkver] To begin, I will note that the President's report, strictly speaking, does not contain any particular news. Last year the Pentagon unambiguously announced its intention to begin manufacturing binary weapons, so called because they are made up of two components that on impact form a deadly nerve-paralyzing compound. [passage omitted]

It is true that Congress set a condition: that U.S. NATO allies agree with these plans. Now the President informs the congressmen that such agreement has allegedly been obtained. True, this information is not, to put it mildly, accurate. At the last

NATO Council session representatives of six countries -- Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark, Greece, Iceland and Luxembourg -- frankly stated that they reject plans for production of binary weapons and in any event will not permit the weapons' deployment [razmeshcheniye] on their territory. Other NATO countries, although not categorically, also failed to express a particular desire to become bridgeheads in a U.S. chemical war. However, it seems to me that the most important thing is not the breakdown of the voting in the NATO council where U.S. representatives, as you know, can twist their partners' arms, and use various methods of pressure to achieve the adoption of decisions favorable to Washington. What seems more significant to me is the very fact of Washington's open advocacy of the production of yet another, even more deadly, kind of weapon. [passage omitted]

Incidentally, in the elaboration of the relevant international convention material progress has been achieved of late, both at the Geneva Disarmament Conference and at bilateral meetings, for example, during the recent visit by the USSR minister of foreign affairs to London. And at the very moment when the world public, including in the U.S. itself, is widely discussing the prospects for curbing the arms race, the White House is preparing to start another spiral in this most dangerous race.

[Pravdin] How are we to explain Washington's position? I think one should look for the answer to that question first and foremost in the interests of the U.S. military-industrial complex. Take, for example, appropriations for the production of the very same binary weapons.

Here, things are clearly not restricted only to \$163 million. Senator Pryor, for example, believes the so-called big egg -- as the U.S. bomb for binary shells has been christened -- will swallow up, as he put it, \$1.5 billion. That is the large sum that the U.S. chemical companies intend to get in their safes. It is these people, through their representatives both in the White House and in Congress, who are pushing ahead the plans for a further arms race, including in such a most dangerous field as chemical weapons.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1492

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

NEW CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONTROL PROPOSAL FROM FINLAND

Helsinki UUSI SUOMI in Finnish 25 Jun 86 p 9

[Article by Tapani Vaananen: "Results Very Important from the Foreign Policy Point of View. New Chemical Weapons Control System from Finland"]

[Text] Finnish researchers have developed a new type of an efficient and functioning control system for chemical weapons. The system will be introduced to representatives of the superpowers in the disarmament negotiations in Geneva in August.

By means of a measuring system, incorporated in the method, the storage, transport and development of chemical weapons, even on foreign territory, could be detected under favorable conditions. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs considers the research results very significant from the point of view of Finland's foreign policy.

A research team, working since 1973 under the leadership of Professor Jorma K. Miettinen, has recently completed a model for a control system, based on which controls over the use and storage of chemical weapons could be centered. The negotiators of the superpowers have considered the results of the Finnish researchers excellent.

"We have done research on the spreading of toxic gases in the air. In the tests, a gas substitute was spread in the wind and subsequently measured at measuring stations at distances of 5 to 140 km. At all distances, it was possible to recognize the gas by means of the measuring equipment developed by us," says Professor Miettinen.

What this means in practice, is that a dense international network of measuring stations would be able to detect the use, transport and storage of chemical weapons, the probability of detection being all the better as more time passes. Frequently, in handling a material, small amounts of toxic gases are released into the air and these amounts can now be measured even at long distances.

Black Box to be Expected

In addition to the now completed tests of air measurements, the sensitive analyzing methods will be utilized in production control at industrial plants.

"By placing a black box for example in a plant producing insecticides, we can guarantee that, for example instead of producing insecticides, the plant does not produce, say, toxic gases. Allowing placing these boxes should be much easier for nations than allowing live inspectors at plants," says Miettinen.

It is expected that the first results of the usefulness of the black boxes will be received in a few years. The control method will eventually be offered in Geneva for the use of the superpowers.

Important Part of Foreign Policy

"It can be said that there are three important active fields of operation in Finland's foreign policy: peace corps, the CSCE process and the development of chemical weapons control systems. We cannot promote the actual disarmament negotiations, but we can contribute to creating a better climate for them," says Jukka Valtasaari, deputy chief of the political section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The research team consists of over thirty Finnish researchers, most of them working without pay, in addition to their own jobs. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs subsidizes the project with well over one million markkas annually. The work is coordinated by Doctor Marjatta Rautio, and its active members are Professor Erkki Rahkamaa, Antti Hesso, M.S., from the National Institute of Occupational Health, and Doctor Maritta Kokko from the Helsinki University.

"Along the years, we have offered young researchers an excellent opportunity to demonstrate their skills by working on a high-quality project. In this way, the project has profited from the use of highly trained work force," says Miettinen.

A summary of the test results concerning remote transportation will be published within the next few weeks in a series of books by the research team. At the end of the summer Professor Miettinen will go to Geneva to present the research results to the disarmament negotiators. Eventual decisions on the application of the system will be made by the actual parties in the Geneva weapons limitation negotiations. Finland cannot directly influence the issue.

12956

CSO: 5200/2700

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS REPORTS ON U.S.-SOVIET TEST BAN TALKS

Talks Open

LD251328 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 25 Jul 86

[Text] Geneva July 25 TASS - Soviet-American talks on the problem of discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests started here today. They are to cover a whole range of questions: The control and the mapping out of ways of the complete turning down of nuclear tests.

The Soviet delegation is led by Andronik Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Use of Atomic Energy, and the U.S. delegation - by Robert Barker, assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

'Cornucopia' Test Noted

LD271459 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1018 GMT 27 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jul (TASS) -- TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Soviet-American negotiations on the problem of stopping nuclear weapon tests have started in Geneva. These negotiations, which are supposed to include both questions of control and the determination of ways toward a total rejection of nuclear tests, have again drawn the attention of the public to a problem whose exception, topicality, and importance can hardly be overestimated.

One need not to be a military specialist to understand: ceasing nuclear tests means embarking on a realistic path toward stopping and turning back material preparations deployed by imperialism for a nuclear duel. Proceeding from this point, and thoroughly weighing all pros and cons, almost 1 year ago, on the day of the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy, the Soviet Union came out in favor of ending nuclear tests.

If the U.S. Administration joined the Soviet initiative, if it took the step that people expected and expect of it, an end would be put to further improving nuclear weapons and there would be a real movement toward total elimination. But no! Those U.S. circles that represent the interests and aspirations of the military-industrial complex, of the "weapon kings", are continuing to follow the former militarist course. This has once more been testified to another nuclear test carried out on 24 July at the Nevada range, the 15th since the USSR introduced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear weapon tests.

It is characteristic that this nuclear test, code-named 'Cornucopia' was carried out, as is reported, 1 day ahead of schedule, in order to forestall protest demonstrations that were being prepared. But the growing wave of indignation in the United States and all over the world cannot be quelled with such tricks! Millions of peace supporters, prominent political and public figures in various countries, famous military experts, and authoritative scientists resolutely condemn the militarist course of the ruling circles of the United States, their stubborn refusal to give a positive response to the Soviet moratorium. "We are convinced that the security of both the Soviet Union and the United States would be substantially strengthened if there were a total ban on nuclear tests", the declaration of the participants in the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban which was held in Moscow recently, emphasizes.

Today, when it has been proven irrefutably that control over nuclear explosions is possible, the supporters of nuclear tests do not even have the semblance of arguments that could justify their dangerous militarist line. Having greeted the report of the beginning of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva with interest and attention, the international community repeatedly expresses the hope that the United States will, with all responsibility, weigh up the degree of danger which is hanging over the world, and will display a realistic approach to the Soviet initiative. A ban must be put on nuclear tests! People are waiting for this, they are demanding it.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW PRESS CONFERENCE OF SCIENTISTS AGAINST NUCLEAR TESTS

TASS Report

LD141617 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1455 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 14 Jul (TASS)--The latest seismological achievements exclude the possibility of carrying out any unverified nuclear blasts. This was the conclusion reached by eminent specialists from 35 countries, said Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He addressed a news conference here today on the results of the 3-day international forum of scientists "for an end to nuclear tests."

The academician announced that the group that initiated the forum was received today by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and handed the Soviet leader a declaration signed by the scientists.

Yevgeniy Velikhov recalled that the forum welcomed the agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council, following which seismic equipment was set up by U.S. and Soviet scientists next to Semipalatinsk/Soviet Kazakhstan. The setting up of the same equipment is envisaged in the U.S. state of Nevada.

The work in Kazakhstan shows that the USSR is ready to prove in practice that it is striving for peace and the creation of an atmosphere of trust between the two powers said Adrian de Wind, chairman of the U.S. National Resources Defense Council.

A scientist from Britain Professor Joseph Rotblat (Great Britain) stated at the press conference that the USSR's unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts is a most important manifestation of a new thinking, based on the fact that escalation in armaments does not guarantee security. On the contrary, this process increases the possibility of a nuclear conflict. It is characteristic that in the United States itself, as a public opinion poll has shown, the number of supporters for the Soviet moratorium has recently grown from 40 to 56 percent, and in Great Britain it has been approved by 84 percent of those already polled.

Dr (Theodore Taylor), who played a part in the development of nuclear weapons after World War II, stressed that he now feels total revulsion for such weapons as a means of mass destruction. Noting the USSR's peaceloving position and the moratorium it has held to for almost 1 year, the scientist voiced the hope that the United States too will in the end follow the USSR's noble example. In Taylor's view, carrying out further nuclear tests will lead to the creation of new 'Pandora's boxes' which could contain such things as "Star Wars" and other horrific means of destruction.

The representatives of the USSR, the United States, Britain, Italy, Sweden, and Denmark taking part in the news conference issued an appeal to the U.S. government to proceed in joining the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium and conclude a total test ban agreement before it is too late. They expressed the hope that other nuclear powers also would join a Soviet-U.S. agreement.

Velikhov Comments

LD141923 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1635 GMT 14 Jul 86

[Text] A news conference devoted to the outcome of the work of the international forum of scientists for a halt to nuclear testing was held at the USSR foreign ministry Press Center in Moscow today. Those taking part in the forum spoke to journalists about its work and about issues discussed at the forum. Academician Velikhov spoke at the news conference and, among other things, said:

[Begin Velikhov recording] I will try to give a brief summary of the importance of the forum. The primary matter the forum discussed was the enormous importance in principle of the moratorium on nuclear testing for improving the entire international situation and for creating a new international atmosphere in the whole sphere of talks on halting the nuclear arms race. The forum evaluated this as a victory for a new way of thinking, a way of thinking which Maikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about both in Paris and in Geneva, a way of thinking in which it must be understood by everyone that today security is possible only on a joint basis. We have no interest in the United States feeling itself to be less secure than the Soviet Union, Maikhail Sergeyevich said. The Soviet moratorium is precisely a demonstration, a specific example, of this new way of thinking.

The forum discussed the question of technical means of monitoring compliance with a moratorium and subsequently a total ban on nuclear weapons testing. There was a common view at the forum that it is possible to covertly conduct a significant series of tests having any military importance. And so, technically speaking, the road to concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty is open.

The second of the forum's most important conclusions is that the continuation of nuclear testing in a historical sense, over the 23 years of underground testing since the Moscow Treaty on a partial test ban was concluded, has led to what might be termed qualitative changes in nuclear weapons, and has led to these weapons substantially worsening the stability of the strategic balance. This in fact acts against the principle of identical mutual security and undermines stability. Furthermore, discussion of prospects for further development showed quite reliably, I would say, that there is no chance whatsoever that any kind of new nuclear weapon could improve the situation.

Therefore, the general conclusion was reached that the question of immediately calling on all nuclear countries--first and foremost the United States, but other nuclear powers as well such as Britain, France, and China--to join in the Soviet moratorium and halt all nuclear testing has now acquired the utmost topicality. I would like to tell you that this is a very important and solid step toward stopping the arms race and safeguarding mankind's future.

And today, after the forum had ended, an event took place that was very important to us. A very great impression has been made on me by the meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. We presented Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with the forum's declaration, and I would say that, given that 34 countries, people of the most varied convictions, were represented at this forum, the fact that this declaration was adopted unanimously makes a great impression. Having read the document, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said he considered this a responsible document composed by a component forum and deserving of the most serious attention. The Soviet Government will examine and reply to the questions posed in the declaration. [end recording]

Professor Taylor from the United States:

[Begin Taylor recording in English fading into Russian translation]
This forum in Moscow has become an important step in my realization of the danger represented by nuclear weapons. In the forties, I was present in Los Alamos at the tests and was among those adherents to nuclear weapons who thought that, through it, there may be an end to wars. But the tragedies of Korea and Vietnam have shown us the fallibility of our position. I have felt complete aversion to nuclear weapons since then and I will never joint those who think that they may play a part in politics. I think that the forum in Moscow has led to the same conviction in all those who have participated.

The Soviet Union has announced a moratorium on nuclear tests. We wish to appeal to the U.S. administration once more to follow the courageous example of the Soviet Union. We wish to call upon the U.S. government to shake off its torpidness. Other countries that have nuclear weapons must also join in this process because the continuation of tests, I am sure of this, will lead to new dangerous consequences. Star Wars, for

example, is also a new Pandora's box that poses a threat to all mankind. I understand the mood existing in the Soviet Union that has halted nuclear tests but has not yet received a positive answer from the United States. I would like to call upon the Soviet Union to show patience once again. I wish to assure you that many, very many people in the United States will do all they can so that our country will join the moratorium on nuclear tests. [end recording]

The participants in the news conference answered questions from journalists.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: WORLD'S SCIENTISTS DISCUSS NUCLEAR TEST MONITORING

PM160833 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Real Step Toward Disarmament"]

[Text] The movement of the world's scientists to avert the nuclear threat is today acquiring not only immense scope but new quality. Launching extensive work to explain the destructive consequences of the arms race, they have embarked on real actions aimed at using facts to demonstrate the possibility of concrete moves along the road toward eliminating nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century. The 3-day meeting of the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban ended 13 July and convincingly showed the desire of the representatives of world science to do everything possible to prevent a catastrophe. They expressed the firm conviction that through joint efforts a substantial contribution to the solution of the most important task currently facing mankind could be made. In the unanimous opinion of the forum participants, the scientists' antiwar movement has switched from explanatory work to specific deeds.

Scientists from 35 countries who gathered in Moscow expressed unanimous support for the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. To use their words, this act of goodwill has made all activists in the scientists' antiwar movement exceptionally determined and has summoned them to take resolute actions. In just 1 month the USSR Academy of Sciences and U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council joint group completed preparations for and started implementation of a Soviet-U.S. seismic project aimed at proving the absolute possibility of detecting a nuclear test of whatever yield.

I have just returned from Semipalatinsk, where together with Soviet specialists I started setting up instruments to detect nuclear explosions, American scientist T. Cochran stated to ardent applause from those assembled. Because of our joint group's still limited opportunities, we were unable to conduct similar work at Soviet and U.S. test ranges simultaneously, but the Soviet side kindly suggested that we start work with Semipalatinsk. T. Cochran expressed gratitude for the help given by the inhabitants of the mining settlement near the area where the scientists set up their seismographs on granite cliffs. My colleagues, he said, are continuing their fieldwork and I have rushed to your forum to show you the first seismograms we obtained.

The scientist showed the forum participants a long strip of paper bearing the signatures of all the participants in this first real descent by Soviet and American scientists onto the "planet of open peace" conceived by Niels Bohr. It is quite clear, he said with a smile, that seismologists will be quite bored in the Soviet Union, since there will be no nuclear explosions there, but we have compiled a busy work program that will be of immense importance both for the progress of talks on the verification [kontrol] of nuclear weapons tests and for fundamental problems of earthquake forecasting.

On the basis of the results of the discussions, the meeting participants adopted a declaration in favor of banning nuclear tests. A forum action group intends to present it to the leaders of the nuclear powers and the UN secretary general, and to disseminate it in national committees for the prevention of the nuclear threat.

The world is facing a merciless reality, the document stresses. Human civilization will not survive a nuclear war. Active measures are needed to minimize this risk. The first step along this road could be a verifiable [poddayushcheyesya proverke] total nuclear test ban which in the future would promote the destruction of all nuclear arsenals. This would mark a resolute turn toward trust, the triumph of common sense, and open international intercourse. In order to achieve this goal we need new thinking, the most important manifestation of which was the unilateral Soviet moratorium, which opened up immense opportunities for a total nuclear test ban.

The forum participants expressed the hope that the United States for its part would adopt the same moratorium decision and that the Soviet Union would deem it possible to extend the moratorium. We also hope, the declaration says, that all nuclear powers in all parts of the world will join in this and other initiatives aimed at reducing the risk of nuclear war.

The latest achievements in the sphere of seismology in conjunction with the relevant jointly observed international procedures, including on-site inspection [inspektsiya], the declaration notes, would ensure a high level of confidence that nuclear tests would no longer be held. This conviction will grow still further if international cooperation is further developed.

The forum welcomed the agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council, under which seismic equipment has been set up on a Soviet test range near Semipalatinsk. The experiments held there have demonstrated the possibility of joint verification [kontrol] for the total prohibition of nuclear tests.

The participants in the international meeting urged the leaders of all the nuclear powers to reach agreement on banning all nuclear tests. They also asked the UN secretary general to use his high prestige to successfully solve a task which is exceptionally important for all countries. We hope, the forum participants stated, that in the future a total, verifiable [poddayushcheyesya proverke] nuclear test ban could lead to the complete annihilation of nuclear arms and other mass destruction weaponry.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

U.S. SCIENTISTS IN KAZAKHSTAN DETECT TEST IN NEVADA

PM280800 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondent G. Dildyayev under the general heading "New Nuclear Explosion in Nevada": "Karkaralinsk: Scientists Cooperating for Peace"]

[Text] U.S. scientists in Kazakhstan have recorded a nuclear explosion at the test site in Nevada. Instruments picked up the shock wave that had sped through 14 time zones.

Karkaralinsk is in central Kazakhstan. It is there that the Soviet-U.S. experiment to check that nuclear tests are not being carried out is being implemented.

The town lies near some mountains covered with dense pine forests and with lakes of deep-blue water in the cols. The "Shakhter" holiday center provides the U.S. seismologists' accommodation.

Professor J. Bruin of California State University, San Diego, leader of the group, and O. Stolyarov, laboratory chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Earth Physics Institute, are quite indistinguishable from the other vacationers except that Oleg Aleksandrovich is wearing a t-shirt with the emblem of the experiment on it.

Only a month ago the U.S. Committee for the Protection of Natural Resources and the USSR Academy of Sciences signed an agreement to conduct an experiment to refute the view held in the United States that infallible monitoring of nuclear explosions is impossible. It is impossible to tell whether they are being conducted or not, they say. The joint experiment by the two countries' scientists should demonstrate to everyone that verification of the cessation of nuclear tests is a perfectly realistic task. The agreement envisages setting up seismographic facilities in Kazakhstan and Nevada.

"So it was not for its natural beauty that Karkaralinsk was chosen?"

"Of course not," James Bruin said. "The fact is that the bedrock here transmits underground vibrations well."

Three supersensitive monitors have been set up on a sun-drenched boulder, each of them recording a separate frequency band. The readings are summarized by a digital recorder. In a laboratory in one of the holiday center buildings the readings are read off magnetic tape by a recording device. I would describe it as sophisticated. Indeed, if an ant scurried by you would hear it,

"Look," geophysicist Kit Priestley pointed to the seismograph. "We have recorded an 'earthquake.' Do you see those flashes? The peaks on the seismogram are the traces of an underground nuclear explosion. They go from margin to margin on the paper."

It was planned to carry out observations for a year. The results are open, and under the terms of the agreement they will be accessible to any interested party.

The first stage of the experiment is under way at the moment -- the signals coming to the earth's surface are being recorded. The spots where the 100-meter pits will be sunk have already been chosen. The monitors will be lowered into them. This will eliminate interference and prevent extraneous noise from being recorded. At the moment, the seismometers are even registering footsteps.

To all appearances there have been more problems organizing the work of the group of Soviet geophysicists in Nevada. At any rate, the U.S. side finds itself unable to install the stations simultaneously -- there are no U.S. state institutions among the organizations funding the experiment. But there is an organization like, for example Mothers for Nuclear Disarmament.

"According to the information we have at the moment," O. Stolyarov said, "Soviet experts will be able to do to Nevada in early fall. The research program is identical to the one being conducted here. The same equipment will be used. That is, everything has been provided for in order to increase confidence in the information that is obtained."

For nearly a year there have been no underground nuclear explosions in our country. The moratorium is in operation. This rare word from the diplomatic lexicon is now known to everyone and has acquired new significance. Not merely a temporary postponement of the discharge of duties, but a powerful manifestation of goodwill and genuine love of peace -- that is what the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions is.

On the eve of the nuclear explosion the tip of the automatic recorder, registering all quiet on the endless tape of the seismograph, stuttered just a little. You can expect the odd leap: Tectonic forces have stirred somewhere in response to ore being shifted in a nearby pit. But the instruments were ready to pick up the shock wave from the explosion at the Nevada nuclear test site as it swept across 14 time zones. That is what happened.

The U.S. seismologists are happy with the sensitivity of their instruments.

"We believe we will record all explosions in Nevada," J. Bruin said. "Although, to be honest, I would like them to stop altogether as soon as possible."

"As a matter of fact that is why we came here," geologist Paul (Bodin) and technician David (Karrel) added.

For many years the areas adjoining the Soviet test site in Kazakhstan were strictly closed to U.S. experts. It is obvious why this was done. Today they are here with all their monitoring equipment, although our conscientiousness needs no verification. That is not the point. Our "silent" test site takes the wind out of the sails of those who keep saying that it is impossible to verify the cessation of nuclear explosions.

The Soviet and U.S. scientists' vigil continues. It has a noble purpose: To halt nuclear weapon tests, and that is why Soviet and U.S. experts are working so harmoniously in Kazakhstan.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: RESULTS OF JOINT MONITORING EXPERIMENT DISCUSSED

LD291201 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 29 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- The first results of the Soviet-U.S. experiment to monitor possible nuclear tests have been discussed by the two countries' seismologists at the Otto Schmidt Institute of the Physics of the Earth of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

James S. Bruin, professor at the University of California at San Diego, has said that two seismic stations are already functioning in the area of Semipalatinsk and another one will come into operation soon.

He pointed out the correctness of the choice of the site for the instruments. A low level of seismic background creates good conditions for monitoring. The second phase of monitoring is to be completed in November when the installation of computer-controlled equipment in deep holes will be started. Monitoring will be conducted for a year. The results of the monitoring are to be simultaneously processed and analysed in the scientific institutions of the two countries.

Similar seismic stations staffed by Soviet and American specialists are to be sited in Nevada as well.

However, the U.S. equipment installed in Kazakhstan has already recorded both nuclear explosions conducted at the Nevada test range in July at a time when the Soviet Union for almost a year already has been refraining from nuclear tests.

This is once again confirmed by the monitoring conducted by American seismologists themselves in the area of Semipalatinsk.

The experiment being conducted jointly by the scientists of the USSR and the USA convincingly proves that there are no obstacles to a total ban on nuclear tests, and that effective verification in this field is possible.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET PAPER INTERVIEWS FRG SEISMOLOGIST ON VERIFICATION

PM281401 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with Hans-Peter (Kharyes), professor at Bochum University, by own correspondent V. Kuznetsov in Geneva, under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview": "Hans-Peter (Kharyes): Nuclear Tests Can Be Verified" -- date of interview not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Geneva -- The experiment by Soviet and American scientists, who have installed a seismological station in the Semipalatinsk region to verify the nuclear test ban, is attracting enormous attention among the international scientific public.

The first results of this experiment -- the recording by instruments marked "Made in the United States" of the 14th and 15th American nuclear tests at the Nevada range -- show once again that existing technical means of verification could act as a reliable guarantee of a treaty on a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban.

What, in your view, is the international significance of the Soviet-American experiment?
[paragraph continues]

That was the question IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked prominent West German seismology expert Prof Hans-Peter (Kharyes) of Bochum University.

"The Semipalatinsk example," he replied, "was noted with enthusiasm by a special group of scientific experts in seismology working in Geneva under the auspices of the Conference on Disarmament. I regard as very important the agreement on joint research work in the sphere of the methodology of verification of nuclear tests. This is a kind of breakthrough in the distrust and suspicion that for many years have accompanied the problem of a nuclear test ban.

"This suspicion, this opinion that there is no reliable possibility of verifying underground explosions, was what led in 1963, when the Treaty on Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Three Environments was concluded, to the exclusion of underground nuclear tests from its sphere of operation. Of course, the Moscow Treaty was a significant step forward. But if the threshold of suspicion had been crossed at that time, there would be no need today to struggle for a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, and there would now be no cruise missiles, neutron weapons, or multiple nuclear warheads.

"But they exist, and is the world any more secure? Of course not. The nuclear explosions in Nevada are a new generation of nuclear weapons, including nuclear-pumped x-ray lasers.

"Today," H.-P. (Kharyes) went on, "experts in seismology possess sophisticated means of detecting even the least powerful tests. National seismological means of verification -- and this fact has been confirmed repeatedly -- are sufficient. It is well-known that Soviet seismologists picked up the characteristic traces of the American 'Mighty Oak' explosion in Nevada, whose yield was only 1.3 kilotons. Another fact. As a result of the moratorium imposed by the Soviet Union, American seismological stations are working normally, confirming that the Soviet Union is not carrying out nuclear tests. Thus the seismologists create a firm guarantee of verification.

"The pooling of efforts by USSR and U.S. scientists to improve seismological verification methods is evoking a major political response. But the internationalization of this experiment, giving it a broad international character, would now, in my view, be of even greater significance.

"We have entered the nuclear age," H.-P (Kharyes) said in conclusion, "and we must change the old way of thinking, whereby superiority in arms secured commanding heights in politics. Today this concept is obsolete and the rapid development of technology in the service of the military requires new, cautious handling of the atom, strict international verification, and, first and foremost, a ban on all nuclear weapon tests. We experts have had our say: Any nuclear tests can be reliably verified. Now it is up to the politicians, up the will and wishes of the countries participating in the Conference on Disarmament. One would like to hope that a treaty on a general and complete nuclear test ban will be signed soon and we will be able to enter the 21st century without nuclear weapons."

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. 'CORNUCOPIA' TEST IN NEVADA, ASSAILED

TASS Report

LD241937 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Washington July 24 TASS -- The USA conducted another nuclear test, the second one in the past eight days, at the Nevada test site today.

A spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy said the yield of the explosion codenamed "Cornucopia" was up to 20 kilotons. The test was not announced before detonation.

This test has already become this year's eighth one officially announced by the U.S. Department of Energy and the fifteenth one since the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

The new test of a nuclear device has shown once again that the United States, ignoring the Soviet Union's call to join its moratorium and widespread protests around the world, continues to pursue a course towards undermining efforts aimed at curbing the nuclear arms race.

The USA's unwillingness to show a constructive approach to the problem of complete and general ban on nuclear tests is also evidenced by pronouncements by a whole number of U.S. officials.

At the same time prominent U.S. arms control experts, mass public organisations, and a large number of members of U.S. Congress caution that the sophistication of the existing types of nuclear weapons and the development of new ones -- this is what the administration conducts nuclear tests for -- undermine not only international security but the security of the United States itself as well.

It is being emphasised in this connection that particular threat to mankind is posed by the "star wars" programme which is being worked out by the administration and which envisages the orbiting of nuclear strike weapons.

However, as is evidenced by the latest test in Nevada, the U.S. Administration, which in words states its readiness to seek jointly with the Soviet Union the elimination of death-carrying nuclear arsenals, in actual fact in every way opposes making if only one step towards ending the arms race.

Worldwide Demands for Test Ban

LD26006 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast: "Studio 20" with anchorman Aleksandr Serikov presenting a telebridge with Bonn correspondent Vladimir Kondratyev, Washington correspondent Vladimir Dunayev, and London correspondent Boris Kalyagin, with introduction by "Vremya" presenter Yevgeniy Kochergin -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kochergin] As already reported, the United States has conducted a routine nuclear explosion at a test site in the state of Nevada. We switch over to "Studio 20".

[Serikov] Hello, comrades. This explosion is the second in the past 8 days alone and prior to this, there was no announcement about its being conducted, as is normally the case. It will soon be a year since our country unilaterally introduced a moratorium on nuclear tests. The United States has exploded nuclear devices 15 times in this period. Today we have been linking video channels with some of our correspondents abroad. We wanted to know the attitude toward the new nuclear explosion in the countries where they are accredited. So, over to our Bonn correspondent, Vladimir Kondratyev:

[Kondratyev] There were only very short reports about the explosion in Nevada in West German newspapers today, and not in all of them, and practically without any commentaries. Apparently it does not blend well with information of a different type from Washington; this is given prime coverage. It concerns the conversations which FRG Foreign Minister Genscher, held with his U.S. colleague Shultz after his visit to the Soviet Union. [passage omitted] As has often been the case in the past, the peaceloving talks remained just talks. Then, having taken leave of their guest from the FRG, the United States gave the go-ahead to conduct a new routine underground explosion, knowing full well that it could not be evaluated other than as a provocation, as a demonstrative challenge to world public opinion.

[Serikov] In this connection, what is the public view with respect to the new U.S. nuclear explosion.

[Kondratyev] The closer we get to 6 August, the date when the effectiveness of the Soviet moratorium ends, the stronger the movement grows in the FRG in support of demands to end nuclear tests. [passage omitted]

[Vladimir Dunayev] American newspapers and television have barely reported a word about the new nuclear test in Nevada. There are no commentaries, no discussions.

Today, I called the NBC television company and asked what the reason for this was, why were there no commentaries. The Washington office of NBC told me that this is a routine thing and asked what was there to comment on? It is the second explosion in a week. Since the beginning of the year, there have already been eight underground nuclear tests in Nevada. What is new about that, when it is normal and routine, so to speak?

However, I think there are deeper considerations here. It is one thing when underground tests are being conducted by both sides. It is a different matter when, for

almost a year now -- on 6 August, Hiroshima Day it will be exactly a year -- only the U.S. side has been conducting nuclear tests. The Soviet Union has been adhering to a test moratorium. In these conditions, apparently they are not interested in informing either readers or listeners that a new routing test of nuclear weapons takes place and that the arms race continues and, it is clear through whose fault.

It is better to pretend that nothing is happening.

Now, concerning the timing of the explosion. I recall how an American nuclear test was conducted on Hiroshima Day, 6 August. I recall how, in reply to a Soviet initiative a nuclear test was conducted literally the next day -- and now, yesterday's nuclear test. It took place at that moment when American newspapers, American television are reporting that finally the White House reply has been formulated, or according to their information is supposed to have been formulated, to the most recent Soviet foreign policy initiatives. Although the details of these, or rather of this reply are not reported, the explosion itself has been timed to coincide with this event, this in itself is a detail that hardly inspires anyone, hardly encourages certainty that the proposals themselves will be sufficiently acceptable and motivated by sincere considerations.

[Kalyagin -- identified by caption from London] I have here on the table, today's central British newspapers, or at least the most serious ones. Well, as you can see they look quite substantial, and they are considered to be such. Nevertheless, hardly one of them has inserted a report about the U.S nuclear explosion. In order to be absolutely accurate, I will say that only two dailies of the British press published such reports. One was the MORNING STAR, the newspaper of the British communists. It has justly evaluated the U.S. nuclear test as a provocative step undertaken on the eve of the start of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva about ending nuclear arms tests; and the other -- London THE GUARDIAN. This is a newspaper that reflects the views of liberal circles.

I called the headquarters of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament movement today and spoke with the general secretary of this organization Meg Beresford. Yes, the British peace supporters unfortunately admit that the Fleet Street press shuts its eyes to the American nuclear tests. So far as the movement itself is concerned, it is planning to sharply condemn the U.S. actions that continue nuclear tests despite the fact that the Soviet Union has been observing a moratorium for almost a year.

[Serikov] Reaction, or, more accurately its eloquent absence, with respect to the U.S. nuclear explosion on the part of U.S. loyal NATO allies speaks for itself. But what do they think and say about this in Mexico, the country located closer than others to the U.S. nuclear testing ground. Unfortunately, we were unable to establish a video-link with Mexico. We contacted our correspondent Bronislav Myakota by telephone. [passage omitted] And so, everything we have heard unfortunately, once again bears witness to the fact that the U.S. Administration that speaks of its willingness to strive together with the Soviet Union for the elimination of nuclear weapons, in its deeds for the time being, as we see, opposes in all manner of ways taking even a single step to stop the arms race.

Detected in Kazakhstan

PM281216 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Dildyayev report under the general heading "Nuclear 'Horn of Plenty'"--first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Another nuclear explosion was held yesterday at the Nevada test site. As if to mock common sense and people's peaceful intentions, the ever-inventive initiators of the arms race called it "Cornucopia," which, translated, means "horn of plenty."

Karkaralinsk -- Seismographs labeled "Made in USA" have been ascertaining that all has been quiet around the Soviet test range in Kazakhstan for 2 weeks now. An underground nuclear explosion did shake the ground on the evening of 24 July, but that test took place at the Nevada test site rather than in the desert zone of Semipalatinsk Oblast. Thirteen minutes and fifteen seconds later its tremor caused the needles on instruments set up at Karkaralinsk to waver.

You can understand the alarm felt by the American scientists examining the seismogram. The bitterness of the situation was bound to affect them. However, even such a negative result is still a result for the scientists. It provides a lot of information for the study of the characteristics of the spread of seismic waves.

I found James Bruin, leader of the group of American scientists, early in the morning in the wood surrounding the Shakhter Rest Home, where the American seismologists live and work.

"Can underground nuclear explosions release tectonic forces and trigger the mechanism of an earthquake? The other day, for example, a strong earthquake was recorded in California. Was it set off by the nuclear explosions in Nevada?" -- I asked him.

The scientist's opinion is that there is no direct link here, at any rate science today is not in possession of such data.

"Minor earthquakes can occur in the immediate vicinity of the epicenter of an explosion -- that is sure."

On the other hand, what a powerful wave of indignation has been created throughout the world by the news of the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada! The harm caused to the security of the world people by the continuation of nuclear weapons tests is immeasurable.

"Methods for assessing the damage caused by natural cataclysms exist. I understand them. However, I hope with all my heart that the damage from nuclear conflict never needs to be calculated!" he said.

Scientists are certain that the Soviet-American experiment in the Semipalatinsk region and Nevada will make it possible to develop a method to infallibly record and recognize seismic waves produced by nuclear explosions. This work is intended to last for 1 year. However, the initial phase of the experiment is already demonstrating the absolute feasibility of monitoring [proverka] a test ban. This conclusion formed the basis of the Soviet delegation's new initiative submitted to the Geneva Conference on Disarmament to create a system of international seismic verification [kontrol] of a ban on nuclear weapons tests.

Details of Test Outlined

PM281044 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 86 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev dispatch under the general heading "Nuclear 'Horn of Plenty'"--first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Another nuclear explosion was carried out yesterday at the Nevada test range. As if to mock common sense and the peaceful intentions of people, the ever-inventive initiators of the arms race called it "Cornucopia," which, translated, means "horn of plenty."

New York -- The yield of the explosion was around 20 kilotons. It was staged in a vertical underground mine at a depth of around 450 meters. [paragraph continues]

The test was of one of the new kinds of weapons of mass destruction being developed by the Livermore nuclear laboratory. This is already the eighth nuclear test carried out in the United States this year, and the 15th since the entry into force of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests.

Your correspondent was informed by a representative of the Las Vegas-based antiwar organization American Peace Test that the test was originally scheduled for 25 July, but was moved up a day to forestall the planned protest demonstrations. Not wishing to deviate from their feverish arms race, the Washington administration and the Department of Energy -- which is directly responsible for holding nuclear tests -- have begun an unseemly game with the peace movement activists and the American public, which is disturbed by the threat of nuclear catastrophe. They are trying to outsmart the anti-nuclear demonstrators by changing the timetable of the next explosion and endeavoring to keep the public ignorant about the holding of tests.

But it is as impossible to hide the ominous "experiments" of the nuclear maniacs as it is to conceal the explosions themselves from sensitive seismographs. Protest demonstrations were held today. They took place in Nevada, California, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Texas, and on America's East Coast. Their main slogan is "The Soviet Union has stopped nuclear tests. Why don't we?"

Anxiety is inducing people to act. Activists of a coalition to end nuclear tests from Connecticut held a mass demonstration in front of the Capitol Building. They came to the capital to demand that the legislators say "no" to continuing nuclear explosions. The appeal they brought was supported by four of the state's six congressmen -- Democrats Bruce Morrison, Sam Gejdenson, Barbara Kennelly, and Stewart McKinney; two Republicans of the Reaganite persuasion, Nancy Johnson and John Rowland, remained deaf to their fellow-countrymen's aspirations.

Participants in the rally held on the steps of Congress warmly greeted the scientist Adrian (de Uind), chairman of the board of the public organization Council for the Defense of Natural Resources, who told the assembly that a meeting of Soviet and American scientists in Moscow had reached an accord on siting on Soviet territory a number of seismic stations serviced jointly by Soviet and American personnel. "The U.S. Administration," (de Uind) exclaimed, "can no longer use the question of inspection [inspektskiya] as a pretext to justify its own reluctance to conclude a treaty on a general and complete ban on nuclear tests!"

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S VELIKHOV: TEST BAN NECESSARY, VERIFIABLE

PM241234 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Academician Ye.P. Velikhov by PRAVDA correspondent V. Gubarev: "A Time of Hopes and Decisions"]

[Text] [Gubarev] Many of our readers are now calling on the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban, held in Moscow recently, a "forum of hope." How do you view its results?

[Velikhov] It was very important. During his conversation with the forum participants, M.S. Gorbachev highly rated the work done by the scientific representatives from many countries.

For over 40 years mankind has borne in him the seed of his own destruction -- nuclear weapons -- and for more than 3 decades now talks have been in progress on halting nuclear explosions and nuclear weapon tests. The conclusion of such a treaty would be a very important step toward survival, but, unfortunately, the current U.S. Administration has ended the talks.

As is known, in 1963 a treaty was concluded prohibiting nuclear tests in three environments; there have also been the threshold test ban treaty and the treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Although the latter have not been ratified by the United States, these steps have lead to positive results.

In the past 23 years, a whole series of agreements has been concluded, above all the 1972 treaty limiting ABM defenses, which is the foundation of the entire future nuclear arms limitation process.

But the fact that agreement has not been reached on the complete cessation of nuclear tests has entailed a wide series of adverse consequences. Multiple warheads have been created, which increased the number of nuclear charges tenfold. Tactical nuclear weapons have emerged that are now just as much a threat to mankind's existence as strategic weapons, and much more. Finally, the so-called "ideology of protracted nuclear war" has come into being in the United States. It is, of course, a dubious and dangerous fantasy. We know that most of the world's scientists do not share this view, but, but, unfortunately, it continues to be expressed and propagandized.

[Gubarev] What can we expect in the future?

[Velikhov] In view of today's international situation, the latest statements by the U.S. Administration, and the development of events associated with space weapons, it is now difficult to predict which of the treaties concluded in the seventies will carry on into the nineties. The destruction of SALT II and the continuation of tests may entail an infinite growth in the number of warheads. [paragraph continues]

If we analyze the 5-year plan for the development of strategic armaments that has been published in the United States, we can see that their number will increase by approximately 40-50 percent. But the danger lies not only in quantitative growth (although the buildup of nuclear armaments is dangerous in itself), but also in the qualitative so-called "improvement of nuclear weapons." The basic result is the creation of high-precision weapons, MX-nuclear missiles, submarine-based missiles, and so forth that threaten the other side's retaliatory means. The creation [sozdaniye] of these weapons undermines the stability of the strategic equilibrium and causes a dangerous increase in world tension. Furthermore, so-called "third generation" weapons involve an attempt to direct the energy of a nuclear explosion somehow. The aim is to create [sozdat] weapons that the United States intends to use in a local conflict for a military purpose or as a means of political pressure, and also in space.

Thus, unless appropriate measures are taken, the stability of the existing strategic equilibrium will be substantially undermined in the next 5-year period. It is appropriate to recall here the words of M.S. Gorbachev, who said that the Soviet Union has no interest in making the United States feel less secure than the USSR. We favor equal security, and that is the foundation of the new thinking in the nuclear age.

[Gubarev] How can we prevent events taking a fatal turn for mankind?

[Velikhov] The first step would be a treaty halting nuclear tests, which would close all avenues leading to an arms race on earth and in space. This treaty could be accompanied by a package of agreements for which the USSR has presented drafts now on the negotiating table in Geneva. This would mark the implementation of the program leading to the total destruction of nuclear weapons as proposed by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January.

[Gubarev] What can you say about the monitoring [kontrol] of nuclear tests?

[Velikhov] Those who are against ending nuclear tests are currently putting forward a number of arguments intended to conceal the sole true aim of their continuation -- the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of weapons. The verification [kontrol] argument is one of them.

The sixties saw substantial progress in the seismic monitoring [kontrol] sphere. A worldwide network of 120 seismological stations was created. Some 20 measuring groups were set up expressly to record nuclear explosions, as well as a number of centers in Europe and America.

In the past decade the seismographs' range and dynamic sensitivity have increased and the possibility of satellite recording [regristratsiya] has arisen, thus making global observation possible. The sensitivity of the seismological system has increased by two orders of magnitude.

At the Moscow forum, Soviet scientists noted that even today there are large reserves in the technology for the optimal processing of the signal and the identification of

seismic events. At the moment seismological facilities alone provide a sufficient guarantee to render possible the conclusion of a treaty on the total and universal prohibition of nuclear tests. In fact, today the first thing that is demanded of the U.S. Government is that it simply halt tests under the terms of the Soviet moratorium, and in that way nuclear explosions will not be resumed. Of course, we expect the other nuclear powers to join the moratorium too.

[Gubarev] As is known, some U.S. scientists have "descended" on the Soviet test site region. What is the purpose of this joint work?

[Velikhov] During the Niels Bohr centenary celebrations in Copenhagen we proposed international cooperation to improve seismological monitoring [kontrol] methods. In May, there was the seminar in Moscow at which we agreed on a work program and presented it to our government. I can say with satisfaction that the USSR Government approved and backed our initiative. The purpose of it is to use a new, high-frequency range for recording seismic events that makes it possible to improve by nearly an order of magnitude the threshold of the recording and identification of nuclear explosions. To put this idea into practice it is necessary to have an exact knowledge of the geophysical properties of the earth's crust in the given region. And we will be studying these properties together. This will demonstrate not only the sure possibility of verifying [proverka] a test ban, but also the practical impossibility of conducting secret tests.

The Soviet and U.S. scientists are demonstrating not only real achievements in the improvement of seismological methods but are also acting against the arms race. The joint research program will be carried out in the Semipalatinsk area and in Nevada. Thus, we have every reason to reemphasize that the conclusion of a treaty on the total cessation of nuclear tests in conditions of reliable verification [proverka] is necessary and entirely possible.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN ISSUES

PM301535 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "A Ban on Nuclear Tests: Two Approaches to One Problem"]

[Text] The United Nations declared 1986 the International Year of Peace. The Soviet Union has marked it by advancing major peace initiatives. Their core is the program for the complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction everywhere by the year 2000. The implementation of this program would make it possible to halt the slide toward nuclear catastrophe, the threat of which was indicated yet again by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speech in Vladivostok. A ban on all nuclear explosions is envisaged as a priority step along the path of preventing this catastrophe. The Soviet Union backs up its proposals with concrete actions. For nearly a full year now, the USSR has not carried out nuclear explosions, observing the moratorium it imposed unilaterally -- as an example of goodwill for the other nuclear powers.

Meanwhile military nuclear programs in the United States are proceeding at full speed and are increasingly moving out of the sphere of the quantitative stockpiling of arms and into the sphere of their accelerated qualitative improvement. New types are developed with higher destructive potential on the basis of the wide use of scientific achievements for military purposes. Here, obviously, you cannot get by without nuclear tests. In the course of tests, the concepts for creating fundamentally new nuclear ammunition are also researched, and the foundations are laid for their subsequent design development [konstruktorskiye prarabotki]. Last, nuclear tests serve to test the reliability of models of ammunition already in the armory.

The continuation of nuclear tests objectively encourages the ambitions of the so-called "near nuclear" states, chiefly the strategic partners of the United States -- South Africa, Israel, and Pakistan. This does not help to strengthen the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and leads to the increase of regional contradictions and the undermining of general stability and security.

The time has come to radically resolve, once and for all, the question of a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban.

The USSR consistently seeks the resolution of this question. As early as 1955, it put before all states possessing atomic weapons the proposal to pledge to stop testing these weapons. In 1958, we unilaterally stopped our nuclear tests (the moratorium lasted for about 6 months) and called upon the United States and Britain to take similar steps.

The only response was the continuation of intensive nuclear explosions. Ultimately however, the Soviet Union's efforts played a decisive role in the conclusion of the 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water.

Some progress toward the ultimate goal -- the banning of nuclear explosions in all environments -- was achieved in 1974, when the USSR and the United States signed the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests, which imposed a ban on underground tests with a yield of over 150 kilotons. [paragraph continues]

The 1976 treaty also set limits on the yield of nuclear explosions carried out for peaceful, national economic purposes. Through the fault of the United States, both these treaties remain unratified to this day.

In 1975, the Soviet Union submitted for examination by the UN General Assembly the draft of a multilateral treaty on a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban. Two years later, under pressure from the world public, the United States was forced to hold talks with the Soviet Union with the aim of elaborating an agreement on this issue. Britain also joined the talks. Clear progress was achieved and the text of the treaty and a number of annexes to it were almost completely agreed. Questions of verification were for the most part resolved. The signing of the treaty, which was not detrimental to anyone's security, was on the tip of the pen, so to speak. But at the final stage, in late 1980, Washington broke off the talks. The subsequent years only confirmed the American side's lack of political will to resolve this urgent question. There is only one explanation for this -- the U.S. Administration's desire to wreck the established equilibrium in its own favor and secure military superiority.

The central component in the Pentagon's plans for nuclear tests is the perfecting [otrabotka] of "third-generation" nuclear weapons. Above all it is a question of prototypes of the x-ray laser triggered by a nuclear explosion. Along with perfecting these lasers, it is planned to carry out other tests to create nuclear microwave and accelerator weapons and kinetic energy weapons. A number of American scientists from the Los Alamos nuclear laboratory have pointed out that the intensiveness of tests required for a "third-generation" weapon will increase considerably. In their view, whereas the creation of one type of nuclear ammunition of the first two generations -- atomic and hydrogen -- took an average of around 6 nuclear explosions, perfecting just one type of the far more complex "third-generation" weapons will take 100-200 nuclear tests. There may be several such types of weapons for "star wars." That is the root of the matter.

The Pentagon attaches no less significance to nuclear tests in implementing the extensive program for building up other strategic nuclear arms the U.S. President announced as long ago as 2 October 1981. Under that program, the qualitative improvement of strategic nuclear forces is being carried out under the guise of "modernizing" the American "deterrent forces," and the first-strike potential is being augmented. It is proposed, in particular, to create and deploy MX, Midgetman, and Trident II missiles, B-1B and Stealth bombers, long-range ground-, air-, and sea-launched cruise missiles, ABM defenses using nuclear weapons, and others. It is proposed to produce at least 23,000 new nuclear warheads over 10 years. The Pentagon's increasing nuclear appetites are indicated by the scale of spending on the production and creation of nuclear ammunition. According to a group of American experts, this spending quadrupled between 1979 and 1986 and now stands at approximately \$8 billion, embracing 22 different programs.

Intensive, immoderate nuclear muscle building has created illusions of achieving nuclear superiority over the USSR in Pentagon strategists. Washington uses a range of primitively simple "arguments" to justify its negative attitude toward deciding the question of ending nuclear tests: The United States, it says, is lagging behind the USSR in the sphere of creating the latest arms; periodic checks on nuclear ammunition are needed to maintain the efficiency of the nuclear arsenals; there is no reliable verification [kontrol] of the observance of such a ban; the Warsaw Pact countries have superiority over NATO in terms of conventional arms; and so forth.

The facts, however, indicate something quite different. The United States has systematically outstripped the Soviet Union year after year regarding nuclear tests. It has now carried out more of them than all the other nuclear powers put together, and it has carried out one-third more nuclear explosions than the USSR. Suffice it to say that, during the time that the Soviet moratorium has been in effect, according to official data, 15 more tests have been carried out in Nevada.

The United States refers to the need for periodical verification [kontrol] of the reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal, so as to "be confident" of the efficiency of its nuclear weapons. The logic of this argument shows that Washington intends to sit for an infinitely long time on mountains of its own nuclear warheads. But if you approach the problem of ensuring international security from the position of the USSR proposal to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000, then this "logic" becomes senseless.

Washington is trying to prove that it is impossible to work out reliable verification [kontrol] of the ending of nuclear explosions. First, both the United States and the USSR have reliable inspection [proverka] systems -- national technical means of verification [kontrol]. Second, they could be supplemented with the help of international procedures, as the leaders of the "Delhi six" propose -- by setting up special stations on their territories to observe fulfillment of the accord on ending tests.

The Soviet Union favors very strict verification [kontrol], including on-site inspections [inspektsii]. We have suggested an agreement on this to the United States. Our country also displays readiness for constructive cooperation in the sphere of verification [kontrol]. In the course of just 1 month a joint group of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council completed the preparation of and began implementing a Soviet-American seismic project involving the siting of seismic stations on Soviet and U.S. territory. The aim of the project is to show the absolute possibility of detecting nuclear tests of any yield.

As for the thesis of the Warsaw Pact countries' "superiority" over the North Atlantic bloc in armed forces and conventional arms, in fact they are in a state of equilibrium. This is confirmed by many authoritative Western sources -- for example, the London International Institute for Strategic Studies, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and others.

The Soviet Union regards the ending of all nuclear weapon tests as one of the most important elements in forming an all-embracing system of international security. This is why the Soviet Union has twice extended its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which was announced a year ago, and has done and is doing everything possible to overcome the deadlock in the disarmament process and to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

The moratorium introduced by the USSR met with a very broad positive response in the world. A vivid example of this was the representative forum of scientists from more than 30 countries held in Moscow recently that dealt with the question of banning nuclear tests. The scientists unanimously supported the Soviet moratorium, which opens up tremendous potential for a total ban on nuclear weapon tests. At the same time, it was emphasized that modern means can already ensure a high degree of confidence that nuclear tests are not being conducted. This confidence will be still greater if there is broader international cooperation in this sphere.

The USSR is opening the door to any form of talks on a total ban on nuclear weapon tests and is ready for any variant of a mutually acceptable accord on this burning problem of the nuclear and space age.

"The attitude of states to this problem is a kind of touchstone to verify their policy," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his 9 June address to the working people of the Hungarian city of Csepel. "He who seeks to eliminate nuclear weapons demands a ban. He who clings to these weapons does everything to ensure that tests continue."

All the Soviet Union's proposals are on the U.S. Administration's desk. It is now up to the American side.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET REPORTS ON PHILIPPINE DISCUSSION OVER U.S. BASES

Constitution's View Assessed

LD242142 Moscow World Service in English 1430 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Nikolay Kuzin commentary]

[Text] The committee appointed to draft a preamble for a new constitution of the Philippines has approved a resolution which bans a prolongation of the agreement on the United States military bases in that country. The resolution contains a provision proclaiming the Philippines a nuclear-free zone. It is believed that the Americans store nuclear weapons at their bases in the Philippines. More on the subject from our observer Nikolay Kuzin and this is what he writes:

If the committee's decisions are included in the constitution, the U.S. military bases in the Philippines will in due course become outlawed. Yet this is only the legal aspect of the matter. There is another sphere, that of real politics. An inclusion of the above provisions into the country's future constitution will create at least two versions of its further political behavior. Let's call them conditionally Japanese and New Zealand.

Japan has a sufficiently fully drafted antiwar and antinuclear legislation, yet its ruling quarters prefer to close their eyes to numerous violations of this legislation by the Americans, for example to the import of U.S. nuclear weapons to Japan. So far as New Zealand is concerned it has decided against letting American carriers of nuclear weapons into the country, a decision it has consistently carried into life.

It is the policy of New Zealand that the Philippine leadership seems to take interest in. There is one more question: How will the Americans behave if the provisions on a closure of the bases are included into the Philippine Constitution? The United States has more than once made it clear that it does not want to leave the Philippines. At the same time, it is setting up reserve bases in other points of the Pacific Ocean. Apart from the likelihood of a direct confrontation with the Philippine Government, Washington may act in a roundabout way. For instance, it may try the version to go in order to stay, as it has done in Thailand. After the defeat of its aggression in Indochina, the United States deactivated its bases in Thailand until better days. At present the Pentagon is secretly returning to those bases.

Washington may also try to ensure in the Philippines military positions for some of its close allies. As observers note, Japanese servicemen are taking part for the first time since the Second World War in the current U.S. military exercise in the Philippines. The Japanese troops have been brought to the base in Subic Bay especially for this. In short, the people of the Philippines still have a long and hard struggle ahead to make their antiwar and antinuclear feelings a national policy and to ensure that this policy is consistently carried into life. But including the corresponding provisions into the draft new Constitution, they are making first yet very important moves toward this end. If the people of the Philippines cover this road to its end they will relieve themselves of the burden of the nuclear menace of which they become increasingly aware. They will be able to consolidate the political independence of the country and invigorate the moral climate of the Philippine society. And above all, if the Subic Bay and the Clark field bases, the largest seats of U.S. imperialist aggression and brigandage abroad are closed, the cause of peace and security in the whole of Asia will gain.

TV Debate Noted

PM281741 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jul 86 First Edition p 5

[Reportage by own correspondent L. Kuznetsov: "The Philippines: Remove the U.S. Bases!"]

[Text] Manila, 16 Jul -- "U.S. bases off Philippine soil!" "No to nuclear weapons!" "Work, not missiles!" -- the cameraman began the report by dwelling on these slogans floating above the crowd. "Gradually moving down, the lens shows the strong hands and the faces of the demonstrators..."

It was against the background of these pictures that the discussion of the U.S. military presence in the Philippines, organized by Manila television's channel 13, took place. The most popular and best known Philippine antiwar movement figures Lorenzo Tanada and Jose Kiokno were participants. Taking part on the U.S. side were M. Armacost (U.S. under secretary of state) and R. Armitage (assistant secretary of defense).

From the very beginning of the debate, the U.S. interlocutors were very much on the defensive. They tried to "defend" themselves by using the tiresome old "arguments": U.S. bases serve Philippine interests, they are on the archipelago to create a "balance of forces," to "defend" sea routes, and (most important) to defend against the "Soviet military threat."

The Philippine opponents totally dismantled these "arguments." They pointed out that the U.S. bases were installed on Philippine soil long before the October Revolution, that is, a "Soviet military threat" does not come in to it. They also exposed the fabrication that the Pentagonites did not clear out of the Philippines after independence was declared allegedly at the request of the Filipinos. L. Tanada pointed out that the Americans had simply tricked the Filipinos: For Philippine agreement that the bases should remain they promised mountains of gold and swore that they would grant unlimited assistance which would benefit one and all. Faced as it was with an intolerable situation of postwar devastation, famine, poverty, and disease, Manila gave its consent. But the manna from heaven did not arrive, of course.

The program participants also said that the Pentagon's military facilities are hotbeds of crime, they are inhibiting the country's economic development, and they are forever complicating the political situation. Special attention was paid to the gross violation of Philippine sovereignty. The bases' commanders are disregarding local customs and laws.

Not a single criminal and not a single murderer (many Filipinos have died at the hands of U.S. servicemen) has appeared before a Philippine court. "The bases are an insult to the dignity of Filipinos and their national pride," L. Tanada said.

Finally, the Filipinos pointed out yet another aspect of the U.S. military presence: The bases are not only a source of tension in the Asian-Pacific region, they automatically draw the Philippines, against its will, into the Pentagon's dangerous adventures. The latest example is that act of state terror against Libya, when the bases were placed in a state of readiness. In fact, the Philippines maintains normal relations with Libya.

The debate's conclusion was absolutely clear: U.S. bases have no place on Philippine soil!

Television channel 13 staff told your correspondent that the program has been very successful and many letters have been received thanking its organizer, Jun Reithley.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA COMMENTARY LAUDS DPRK PROPOSAL FOR KOREAN NFZ

PM251739 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[B. Vinogradov commentary: "Clear Out the Nuclear Vaults"]

[Text] It is deeply symbolic that the DPRK Government statement on turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear free peace zone was published on the eve of a memorable date specially marked in the calendar of the peoples' most recent history. The date of 25 June was the 36th anniversary of the day the American imperialists unleashed war against the People's Korea. The 3-year war took hundreds of thousands of human lives, left millions of people without a roof over their heads, and turned many cities and villages in the DPRK into ruins. It is totally understandable that this new and important DPRK Government initiative -- an initiative dictated by the concern to preserve general peace -- has met with approval among all the progressive public. Its topicality is indisputable.

As noted in the statement, aggressive imperialist forces are to blame for the fact that the Korean peninsula is now a constant source of tension and confrontation in the region. South of the 38th Parallel the United States has set up its largest nuclear base in the Far East and deployed a 40,000-strong contingent of armed forces there. Approximately 1,000 American nuclear weapons are already stockpiled on South Korean territory and the Pentagon continues to nurture plans to further increase its nuclear arsenal there.

In particular, the construction of underground nuclear stores is in progress close to the city of (Kunsan) in the South Korean province of Chungchong-Namdo. Back in 1983 the entire population was moved out and the region itself declared a restricted zone. A new vault is being established a few kilometers from the American Camp Isis base, where rear subunits are deployed whose task includes combat supply of nuclear weapons to the troops. On the completion of the works, it is planned to transfer there one of the U.S. nuclear bases at present on Okinawa. Washington openly declares its intention to use nuclear weapons in the Korean peninsula "in case of need." By carrying out military maneuvers on South Korean territory, the Pentagon has been developing the tactics of delivering "nuclear strikes" for several years now.

In the present situation, which is fraught with global catastrophe, the DPRK believes it necessary to take urgent measures aimed at preventing war and ensuring lasting peace in the peninsula. For its part, being a signatory of the Nonproliferation Treaty, and honestly fulfilling the tenets of that document, the DPRK Government pledges itself not to deploy nuclear weapons on its own territory and not to permit their transportation across it. At the same time, Washington is asked to cease bringing new types of nuclear weapons into South Korea, to withdraw all the arms there now stage by stage,

and to abandon all plans to use these weapons in Korea. The DPRK Government has expressed its willingness to begin negotiations with the United States and South Korea on these important issues at any time and in any form.

It is quite obvious that eliminating the nuclear threat in the peninsula would help to improve the atmosphere not only in the Far East but throughout the entire Asian and Pacific region. This is precisely the aim of the DPRK's peace-loving course, which is consistently and steadily pursued by its government in the international arena. The new initiative supplements the series of other constructive proposals made by Pyongyang aimed at attaining this noble goal. Of these one should mention the proposal to Washington and Seoul on trilateral negotiations between military leaders, the initiative on replacing the armistice agreement in Korea with a peace agreement, the initiative on drawing up a declaration on nonaggression between North and South, and others.

The DPRK Government appeal to cleanse the peninsula of the nuclear stockpiles which pose a lethal threat is in line with the aspirations of all peace-loving peoples.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1493

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

FINLAND IN NEW EFFORT TO REVIVE NORDIC NUCLEAR FREE ZONE

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 11 Jul 86 p 11

[Article: "First Its Own Book, Then A Joint Nordic Report; Finland Taking Small Steps Toward A Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone"]

[Text] Finland intends to keep the discussion on a Nordic nuclear-free zone alive by publishing its most important positions over the years in book form. The intent is to publish a report that has been compiled by officers in the Foreign Ministry and also translated into Swedish and English.

Nothing radically new on a nuclear-free zone is presented in the report, which was submitted to Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen on Thursday by the Foreign Ministry's work group.

According to the work group, Finland is best able to promote the project by continually maintaining its own readiness to negotiate, presenting the issue publicly, and by encouraging a public debate.

In Vayrynen's opinion the zone idea is always timely and does not depend on the development of weapons technology. "The mere discussion of a zone already confirms the existence of a Nordic nuclear-free zone," stated Vayrynen in receiving the report.

Mini-Zone Not A Consideration

According to Under State Secretary Klaus Tornudd, who directed the work group, the political conditions are not ripe at this time for initiating negotiations on the establishment of a zone.

Finland has proposed that the governments of the Nordic countries appoint a work group as a first step for clarifying the prerequisites for a zone. The proposal will be brought up in August at the meeting of Nordic foreign ministers in Copenhagen.

It is emphasized in the work group's report that decision-making in zone matters belongs exclusively to the Nordic countries, which should reach a joint understanding on the matter. Other countries can improve the conditions for the establishment of a zone by their actions.

The work group considers a zone comprised of Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark as the minimum alternative for a nuclear-free Nordic area. Iceland's participation is seen as desirable if not necessary.

According to Vayrynen, Finland has always reacted negatively to the idea of a mini-zone made up of Finland and Sweden. "It has never been an alternative to a zone encompassing all of the Nordic area."

On the other hand, a nuclear-free Arctic area has not been in conflict with the basic idea itself in Vayrynen's opinion.

"This has been thought of primarily as an alternative when the discussion has concerned the gradual accomplishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. This idea was mentioned in only one speech, and it is not to be taken so seriously that it would be included in this report," stated Vayrynen.

Cruise Missile Is Worst Problem

In the report cruise missiles are considered to be the most difficult problem associated with a nuclear-free zone. According to Tornudd, Finland has proposed that cruise missiles be taken into account in a so-called negative security guarantee to be obtained from the superpowers.

What is meant by a negative security guarantee is a promise given by the superpowers not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against countries belonging to the zone. According to Tornudd, such promises have already been made.

Norway More Inclined Than Before

In the opinion of the work group an agreement on a nuclear-free Baltic Sea area would in addition to the Nordic countries presuppose the cooperation of all nuclear states and the countries bordering on the Baltic Sea.

Finland intends to bring up the matter of a zone at the meeting of Nordic foreign ministers to be held in Copenhagen in August. Finland has made a new initiative for compiling a joint report by the Nordic countries.

Previously, similar initiatives -- last April, among others -- have failed primarily because of opposition from Norway. Vayrynen believes that the Workers' Party, which has accepted government responsibility in Norway, will adopt a more positive attitude than before to the compiling of a joint Nordic report.

In Vayrynen's opinion a Nordic work group comprised of officials and experts would be the first step forward in the matter of a nuclear-free zone.

"It is clear that the compiling of a joint Nordic report does not yet mean that the establishment of a zone is in sight. The premise of Finland's actions has been and will continue to be that the government of each Nordic country is competent to make decisions on behalf of its own country," said Vayrynen.

10576

CSO: 5200/2720

RELATED ISSUES

GORBACHEV VLADIVOSTOK SPEECH: ASIAN SECURITY, REAGAN NST LETTER

LD281348 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0704 GMT 28 Jul 86

[Speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at festive rally in Vladivostok marking the presentation of the Order of Lenin to the city--live; For the text of Gorbachev's speech, as broadcast on Moscow TV, see the FBIS Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, 29 July 1986, pp R1-R20; for a comparison of the TV broadcast with the text as published in PRAVDA on 29 July, see the FBIS Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, 1 August 1986, pp R7-R9]

[Excerpts] Dear comrades! I had long intended to visit the Far East. And it is not only because a person is attracted to regions where he has not been, by an interest in what he had not yet seen. Without getting to know your great and beautiful land, one's very conception of the motherland and its history, today and in the future, cannot be complete.

The main thing now is to concentrate on the long-term tasks arising for the region from the decisions of the 27th party congress. I think that even such a solemn pretext as the receipt of a lofty award is suitable for a critical examination of this question. These are our common plans and concerns, comrades.

They, better than any eloquent contrivances, speak of the real intentions of the Soviet Union, and however much the ruling forces of imperialism may try to distort them, we have openly and honestly spoken, and will go on speaking to all peoples and governments: Yes, we need peace. Again and again we appeal to them to stop the arms race, to end nuclear madness, eliminate nuclear arms, and to search persistently for political solutions to regional conflicts. [applause]

A phenomenon of enormous significance is taking place before our eyes. The notion that peace is needed by all is powerfully penetrating the consciousness of people even in places where the governments continue to regard weapons and war as a means of policy. Peace is needed by all precisely because a nuclear war would not merely be a clash between two blocs, between the two confronting forces. It will lead to a global catastrophe where all human civilization will find itself under the threat of doom.

Our initiatives for nuclear disarmament and a significant cut in conventional armaments and armed forces, for monitoring and improving the international situation have been met in a diversity of ways. The friendly countries have come out in support of them. The countries of the socialist community quite correctly regard them as an integral part of

the common line of socialism in the international arena. And not only because they, these initiatives, were agreed to by them, not only out of principled internationalist considerations, but also because both of us, we and they, are preoccupied with one and the very same exclusively peaceful deed -- perfection of our societies.

On this basis the beneficial process of drawing together is being invigorated, economic integration is being filled with new content, specific steps are being taken to create joint enterprises and associations, and living contacts between people are getting wider. In a word, a progressive, mutually advantageous process is taking place that deepens the cooperation and brotherhood between the people of the community. [applause]

The developing world regards our plans and intentions, both internal and international, with great interest. We do note that many countries of this world are willing to continue broadening and deepening economic, scientific and cultural cooperation with the Soviet Union. We are ready for this. It would be correct to say that our plans are regarded seriously and with interest by broad public circles, politicians and representatives of the business world in the West who view things realistically, who are free of the paranoia of anticommunism and who are not bound up with profits from the arms race. They also favor peace and cooperation, the development of healthy economic, scientific, and cultural relations with the Soviet Union. We welcome this approach.

But in many capitalist countries, the tone continues to be set by forces whose past and future are blinded by hostility toward socialism, by imperial ambitions, or are bound hand and foot to military-business interests. These interests, as is known, are very greedy and merciless.

Yesterday they needed millions, today billions, tomorrow trillions. They will never start making children's toys instead of missiles of their own will. Such is their nature. The ruling circles of the United States and some of the countries allied to it try to represent our peace initiatives as pure propaganda, or claim that they benefit only the Soviet Union. Yes, disarmament is beneficial to us, if you want to use that term, as it is beneficial for all people whose governments spend billions on the arms race.

But this is only part of the truth, I would even say the lesser part of it. The main truth is that our initiatives are based on profound concern for the fate of mankind. It is absurd and criminal, in the face of the nuclear threat, to act on the old, already dead, concept that what is good for the socialist countries must be rejected. This shows particularly clear class narrowness, primitive ideological automatism, and the growing political influence of militarism. All the same, I am not inclined to think that the military-industrial complex is omnipotent. We see that the world public is ever-more clearly recognizing the danger of militarism. We see in the United States too, that in spite of the constant chauvinist injections realistic attitudes are increasing. The understanding of the fact that the military threat to the United States comes not from Soviet people, not from the socialist countries, not from the peasants of Nicaragua, not from far-off Vietnamese or Libyans, but from its own arms-makers and from the irresponsible politicians and adventuristic military who serve them, is becoming more profound.

We understand of course, that the ruling circles of imperialism are seriously worried by the international influence of our plans, calculated for accelerated socioeconomic and scientific development.

We also know that the accelerating arms race serves not only super-profits and the preparation for war, but also, and not least by a long way, other immoral goals, the essence of which are to wear out the Soviet Union economically, to thwart the course of the party for a further improvement in people's living standard and to slow down the implementation of the social program. We know exactly who is continuing to cherish hopes that a planned and methodical destruction of the USSR and of the socialist countries, using for this purpose economic, moral-psychological, propagandist, political and military means... [as heard]

But, one may say, this business was doomed in the past and it remains hopeless today, too. The time has come to take realities into account and not to shape policies on the basis of illusions and errors. If there are not accords, the world will not feel better, and it will not be at ease. Fear will not go away until certain rulers in the West give up efforts -- which may be comforting for them, perhaps, but fruitless and, the main thing, dangerous -- to bring the Soviet Union to its knees, to split the Soviet society and to delay our progress. Time is insistently demanding a new understanding of the current stage in the development of civilization; of international relations; of the world, of a world that is contradictory and complex but that is objectively united by ties of interdependence; of international relations in which, even taking into account all differences and clashes of interests, one cannot live any longer according to the traditions of the law of the fist that has existed for thousands of years; of a civilization demonstrating the unprecedented power of the human intellect and labor; at the same time, its fragility and vulnerability to forces released by human genius but put at the service of destruction.

All this is dictating the need for an urgent, radical break with of many conventional approaches to foreign policy, a break with the traditions of political thinking, with views on the problems of war and peace, on defense, on the security of specific states, and on international security. One may understand, in this connection, our radical, in the full sense of the word, global proposals, such as the program for liquidating nuclear and other mass destruction weapons in this century. For a complete ban on testing nuclear arms, for banning chemical weapons, for cooperation in the peaceful use of space, and on a whole number of other proposals of concern to the whole world and all countries. The main problem that has been posed today before mankind is the problem of survival; it is equally acute and urgent for Europe, Africa, America, and Asia. It takes a different shape, however, for each part of the world.

Since I am here in Vladivostok, it is natural to look at world political issues from the Asian-Pacific Ocean angle. Such an approach is justified on many counts, above all because a large part of our country's territory lies east of the Urals, in Asia, Siberia, and the Far East. It is here that many all-union tasks put forward by the congress will be solved. Consequently, the situation in the Far East as a whole, in Asia and the adjacent oceanic expanses, where we have for a long time been permanent residents and sailors, is for us a national, state interest.

The Soviet Union is also an Asian and Pacific country. This vast region's complex problems are close to it; it is directly touched by them. This determines the weighed and large-scale view it takes of a gigantic part of the world bringing together a mass of such varied states and peoples. And our approach to that part of the world is based on recognition and understanding of the realities existing here.

At the same time, our interest is not a claim to any kind of privilege or special position; not an egoistic attempt to strengthen its security at someone else's expense; not seeking advantage to the prejudice of others. We see our interest in uniting efforts in cooperation that accords full respect to the rights of all people to live in the way they choose, and to resolve their own problems independently in conditions of peace. We are for the joint building of new and just relations in Asia and the Pacific. I have recently had quite a few meetings with leaders of European states and with various political figures from European countries. One cannot help but compare the situation in Asia with that in Europe. The Pacific region as a whole is not yet militarized to the same extent as the European region. Yet the potential for its militarization is truly enormous and the consequences extremely dangerous. To be convinced of this one has only to take a look at the map. Some of the major nuclear powers are located here, and powerful land armies and mighty navies and air forces have been created. The scientific-technical and industrial potential of many countries on the western and eastern sides of the ocean allow for the spurring-on of any arms race.

This situation is aggravated by the perservation of conflict situations. We shall not forget that it was indeed in Asia that U.S. imperialism waged the two biggest wars since 1945, in Korea and in Indochina. For 4 decades there has been no period of several consecutive years when the flame of military confrontation has not blazed now in one spot in the Pacific Ocean area, now in another.

For better or for worse the Helsinki process of dialogue, talks and agreements is in operation in Europe. This introduces some sort of stability and reduces the probability of armed conflicts. This does not exist or virtually does not exist in the region which we are discussing. And if something has been changing of late then it is not for the better. Since the second half of the seventies the United States has undertaken large-scale measures to increase military forces in the Pacific Ocean. It is under its pressure that the militarized Washington-Tokyo-Seoul triangle is taking shape. And although two of the three states in the region which possess nuclear weaponry, the PRC and the USSR, have pledged not to be first to use it, the United States has sited nuclear-weapons delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads in one of the crisis zones, on the Korean peninsula, and also nuclear-weapons delivery vehicles on Japanese territory. It has to be noted that militarization and the growth of the military threat in this part of the world is beginning to gather dangerous speed. The Pacific Ocean is turning into an arena of military and political confrontation. That is what is worrying the peoples who live here more and more. It also alarms us, from all points of view, including for reasons of the security of the Asiatic part of our country. The Asia-Pacific strand of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is a component part of the overall platform of the CPSU's international activity, worked out by the April Plenum and the 27th congress of the party. However, the platform is not a plan which can be applied to any situation, but rather principles and a method based on experience.

Using this as a starting point, how can one imagine a process of forming international security and peaceful influence in the given vast region? First and foremost the Soviet Union, in accordance with the principled line of the congress, will aspire to give more dynamism to its bilateral relations with all countries situated here, without exception. We will comprehensively strengthen friendship and we are stepping up our diverse ties with the Mongolian People's Republic, with the DPRK, with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, with the Lao People's Democratic Republic, with the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

to see our relations with our friends as relations built on the principles of equal rights and solidarity, as a component part of all-Asiatic and Pacific Ocean security. [applause]

At present, for example, the question of withdrawing a considerable number of Soviet troops from Mongolia is being examined with the leadership of the Mongolian People's Republic.

In the Pacific Ocean region, the Soviet Union also borders on the United States. A close neighbor, in the literal sense of the word: the distance is only 7 kilometers, just the distance between the Soviet island Big Diomede and the American Little Diomede.

We clearly take into account that the United States is a great Pacific Ocean power, because, first of all, a significant part of the country's population lives on the shores of that ocean. The western part of America, which is drawn toward it, is playing a growing role in the country's life and is distinguished by its dynamism, and also, the United States undoubtedly has important economic and political interests in the region. There is no doubt that without the United States, without its participation, one cannot solve the problem of security and cooperation in the Pacific Ocean zone in a manner satisfactory to all the states in the region. For the time being, unfortunately, Washington is not manifesting any readiness for this; it is not even contemplating a serious conversation on the subject of the Pacific. And if this theme is touched upon, then it is led out onto the well-trodden path of the Soviet threat and saber-rattling to strengthen this myth.

Our approach to relations with the United States is known. We are for peaceful, good-neighborly relations on an equal footing, for mutually advantageous cooperation, for which, incidentally, there are quite a few opportunities both in the Far East and in the Pacific Ocean.

As I'm talking about the United States, two words about the most important thing today in our relations: the ending of the arms race. After the Geneva meeting the Soviet Union put forward many major proposals on all the problems of reducing and eliminating arms and on verifying this process.

We have not seen any movement from the other direction. We, in essence, have been regaled with the same fare as before Geneva. To overcome this running in place, we have done even more to meet the other side. In my letter in June to the U.S. President we put forward new, major, compromise proposals.

Already here, in the Far East, I have received a reply from President Reagan. It calls for thought: We have begun to study it. We will deal with this with responsibility and attention. For us, what is important first and foremost is to what extent the proposals contained in the letter respond to the principle of equal security; do they allow us to arrive at effective joint solutions in the field of ending the arms race and not allowing its extension to space? It is in accordance with this that we will determine our future steps.

As far as a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is concerned, I repeat that we favor such a meeting, but are resolutely opposed to the accord reached at the last meeting in Geneva being interpreted as allegedly coming down to a promise to meet in the future, as well. No. The main thing that President Reagan and I agreed on then, and what we signed, was an agreement that we would strive for normalization of USSR-U.S. relations and an improvement in the international situation, and that we would speed up the course of the talks on arms reduction. This is what the new meeting should serve as well.

We often hear from abroad various kinds of conjectures about violations... [as heard; corrects himself]... build-up by the Soviet Union of its armed might in the East of the country. I state with all responsibility that we are neither doing, nor shall do, anything in excess of what meets the minimal requirements for our defense and the protection of our friends and allies, especially taking into account U.S. military activity not far from our and their borders. This holds true also to the fullest degree as regards medium-range missiles. Those who do not wish an easing of tension in the world continue to claim that we can allegedly redeploy our SS-20 missiles from the West to the East, and from the East to the West. Therefore I recall once again that we propose the liquidation in Europe both of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles -- their liquidation and not their redeployment to any other place. Clearly that could not fail to serve the interests of the countries of Asia as well.

I would also like to say that the Soviet Union is a convinced supporter of the disbandment of military groups, of the renunciation of foreign bases in Asia and in the Pacific Ocean, and the withdrawal of troops from others' territory. The USSR is a member of the Warsaw Pact, but that is a European defensive alliance and it acts strictly within its contractual geographical framework. In our turn we resolutely oppose U.S. attempts to extend NATO's competence over the entire world, including Asia and the Pacific Ocean. Our thoughts on security in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region are not built on a void. They take into account experience, both past and present. The principles of Panca-Sila [the five precepts of Buddhism] and Bandung have not sunk into oblivion and the positive examples of the truce in Korea, the 1954 Geneva conference on Indochina and the Indo-Pakistan agreement in Tashkent, have remained in diplomatic experience. At the present time too we can see the efforts of a number of states to tackle in a practical way common economic problems and attempts to somehow settle conflict situations.

The already fairly extensive arsenal of scientific and political projects on the issue of creating a new world economic order and on the experience of integration in the West and in the East, could be a good basis for such discussion. We would propose a Pacific Ocean conference along the lines of the Helsinki conference, with the participation of all countries gravitating [tuagoteyushchiye] toward the ocean, as an objective, if not a close one [kachestve pust ne blizkoy tseli]. When, and, of course, if there is success in agreeing to its convocation, it will be possible to agree on where it should be held as well. One possibility is Hiroshima. Why should not that town -- the first victim of the atomic evil -- become a distinctive Helsinki for Asia and the Pacific Ocean? [applause]

Summing up, I want to stress again that we are in favor of including the Asian and Pacific area in the general process of creating an all-embracing system of international security, which was spoken of at the 27th CPSU Congress.

How do we envisage this in concrete terms? First of all questions inevitably arise of a regional settlement. I will speak on Afghanistan separately. I will not deal with Southeast Asia and Cambodia. The Khmer people have experienced terrible sacrifices. This country, its towns and villages, were more than once subjected to U.S. bombing. Through its suffering it won its right to choose friends and allies, and it is unacceptable to draw out its tragic past and decide the future fate of this state in distant capitals, or even in the United Nations.

Much here, as in other problems of Southeast Asia, depends on the normalization of Chinese-Vietnamese relations. This is the sovereign affair of the governments and leaderships of the two countries. We can only express our interest in seeing the border between these socialist states again becoming a border of peace and good-neighborliness, and a comradely dialogue renewed, with unnecessary suspicions and distrust removed. [applause] The moment for this now seems propitious, and the whole of Asia needs it. In our opinion there are no insurmountable obstacles to the establishment of mutually acceptable relations between the countries of Indochina and ASEAN. Given goodwill and conditions of noninterference from outside, they could at the same time settle their problems for the good of general Asian security.

There is the possibility of not only getting rid of the dangerous tension on the Korean peninsula, but of beginning a movement along the path of solving the national problem of the entire Korean people. If one starts from truly Korean interests, there are no rational grounds for rejecting the serious dialogue being proposed by the DPRK.

Second, we are in favor of putting a barrier on the path of the proliferation and build-up of nuclear arms in Asia and in the Pacific. It is well known that the USSR has bound itself not to increase its medium-range nuclear missiles in the Asian part of the country. The USSR supports the declaration of the southern part of the Indian Ocean as a nuclear-free zone, and calls on all the nuclear powers, either unilaterally or multilaterally, to guarantee its status.

The implementation of the DPRK proposal on the creation of a nuclear-free zone on the Korean peninsula would be a serious contribution. The idea of creating such a zone in Southeast Asia has attracted the attention it deserves.

Third, we propose starting talks on reducing the activity of naval fleets -- primarily ships equipped with nuclear arms -- in the Pacific Ocean. A limitation on competition in the sphere of antisubmarine weapons would help to strengthen stability, in particular an accord from antisubmarine activity in certain zones of the Pacific Ocean, in particular could be a significant confidence-building measure.

In general I would like to say that if the United States were to renounce a military presence, say in the Philippines, we should not be found wanting of any response. We are, as previously, also decisively in favor of renewing talks on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

Fourth, the Soviet Union ascribes great significance to the radical reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Asia up to the limit of reasonable sufficiency. We are aware that it is necessary to resolve this issue in parts, gradually, starting with one particular region, say, the Far East. In this context the USSR is prepared to discuss with the PRC specific steps aimed at a balanced reduction in the level of land forces.

Fifth, the Soviet Union considers that the time has long since been ripe to put onto a practical footing the discussion of confidence-building measures and the nonuse of violence in the region. It is possible to start with simpler measures, for example security measures concerning maritime communications in the Pacific Ocean and averting international terrorism. It would be possible to hold a conference for the discussion and working out of such steps in one of the Soviet coastal cities. By the way, in time it would also be possible to resolve the question of opening up Vladivostok for visits by foreigners. [applause] If it really proves possible to change the situation in the Indian Ocean for the better, Vladivostok could become a major international center, a seat of trade and culture, a city of festivals, sports meetings, congresses and scientific symposiums. We should like to see it as our open window to the East. And then may it be -- to use the phrase of our great Pushkin -- that all flags will come to us as guests. [applause]

In conclusion, concerning Afghanistan. It was stated from the rostrum of the 27th congress that we are prepared to send home the Soviet troops who are in this country at the request of its government. As you know, the party now firmly keeps to the principle: behind the words, action.

Having thoroughly evaluated the situation which has arisen and, conducting consultations with the DRA Government, the Soviet leadership has made a decision which I will officially announce today. By the end of 1986, six regiments -- one tank regiment, two motorized rifle regiments, and three antiaircraft regiments -- along with their established equipment and weapons will be returned from Afghanistan to the motherland. [applause] These units will return to the regions of their permanent deployment in the Soviet Union, and in such a way that all those for whom this may be of interest may be easily convinced of this. Undertaking such a serious step -- concerning which we have beforehand informed states which have an interest, including Pakistan -- the Soviet Union is striving to hasten a political settlement and to provide yet another stimulus toward it. It also uses as a starting point the fact that those who are organizing and implementing armed intervention against the DRA will understand in the correct way this unilateral step we have taken and evaluate it in the proper manner. The response to it must be the curtailment of outside interference in the affairs of Democratic Afghanistan. [applause]

Some progress was recently achieved at Afghan-Pakistani talks being conducted through representatives of the UN secretary general. As soon as a political settlement is finally worked out, the return of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan can be speeded up accordingly. The timing and stages of their return have been agreed with the Afghan leadership. However, all those who encourage and finance the undeclared war against Afghanistan, and from whose territory it is waged, should know that if intervention against Democratic Afghanistan continues, the Soviet Union will not leave its neighbor in the lurch. [applause] Our internationalist solidarity with the Afghan people as well as the security interests of the Soviet Union rule this out absolutely.

We support the line of the current Afghan leadership toward national reconciliation, expanding the social base of the April national democratic revolution, right up to the point of creating a government involving participation by political forces who have been outside the country but which are ready sincerely to participate in the nationwide process of constructing a new Afghanistan.

Comrades, the current generation has inherited many difficult and agonizing problems, and in order to move forward toward solving them we must get rid of the burden of the past and seek new approaches, guided by responsibility for the present and the future. The Soviet state calls upon all Asian-Pacific countries to cooperate for the sake of peace and security. [applause] Anyone who aspires to these goals, who hopes for a better future for his people, will find in us interlocutors of good intent and honest partners. [applause]

A difficult, dramatic time is being experienced by mankind, but it has a reserve of toughness which enables it not simply to survive, but to learn to live in a new civilized world: in other words, to live, knowing no threat of war, to live in conditions of freedom, when the highest criterion of all will be the good of man and maximum opening of the potential of the human personality. But that requires persistent struggle against an enemy common to all: the threat of universal destruction.

Today, as never before, it is important to mobilize the potential of common sense, partnership and reason existing in the world in order to halt the slide toward disaster. Our resolution to do everything incumbent on us to this end is immutable: All can be sure of this, the peoples of all countries and states. [applause]

/8309

CSO: 5200/1502

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: INITIAL COMMENTARIES ON GORBACHEV VLADIVOSTOK SPEECH

Foreign Ministry Press Briefing

LD291648 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 28 Jul 86

["Briefing on New Soviet Initiatives"--TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow July 29 TASS -- The Soviet Union stands strongly for involving the Asian-Pacific region in the general process of creating a comprehensive system of international security, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR, said at a briefing at the ministry's Press Center today.

"This would help strengthen goodneighbourly relations and friendship between the countries of the region and not only have a favorable effect on the situation in the region but also help preserve and consolidate international peace," he said.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had advanced concrete initiatives, ideas and proposals in his speech in Vladivostok, the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said. He described the issue of a regional settlement, the idea of a barrier in the way of the proliferation and buildup of nuclear arms in Asia and the Pacific, the proposal for the start of talks on reducing naval activities in the Pacific, and the problem of a radical reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Asia to a level of reasonable sufficiency as important proposals whose implementation was decisive to the destiny of the nations inhabiting the region.

Gerasimov stressed the special significance of the Soviet Union's decision to return home from Afghanistan by the end of 1986 six regiments with their equipment and arms. "This decision is providing another impulse for a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan," he said.

Answering questions from newsmen about Soviet-Chinese relations, the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said there had emerged the signs of a positive shift in economic relations. "The mutually supplementary natures of the Soviet and Chinese economies offer appreciable opportunities for broadening these relations, including in frontier areas," Gerasimov said.

West European Response

OW290512 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1115 GMT 28 Jul 86

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] Comrade Gorbachev, speaking in Vladivostok, has said that the Soviet leadership will study U.S. President Reagan's reply to the Soviet proposals on arms control with responsibility and attention. The results of this study will be known in due time.

Now, I wish to draw your attention to THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR on the contents of the U.S. President's reply. Western Europe is pushing the United States toward compliance in its answer to the Kremlin on the question of arms control. I think this position of Western Europe has, to a significant extent, been influenced by the recent Soviet-French summit talks and the USSR-UK and USSR-FRG foreign ministers talks. The West European partners in the talks with the Soviet leaders heard first hand a clear explanation of the Soviet policy that is directed at disarmament, the strengthening of peace, and the revival of detente. Apparently, this was conveyed to Washington by France, the UK, and the FRG.

Western Europe adheres more closely to detente than does the United States. Political awareness in the capitals of Western Europe is also higher than that in Washington. Therefore, I believe THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR is correct. Western Europe is indeed pushing the United States toward greater realism, to a greater constructiveness on questions of arms control. To what extent the U.S. reply to the Soviet Union reflects the aspirations of West Europeans, only time will tell. But the mere fact that Western Europe is applying pressure on the United States is very noteworthy.

Certainly, it must not be thought that the Soviet Union, in its talks with Mitterand, Howe, and Genscher, aspired to cause a rift in West European-U.S. relations.

It is clear to all that the Atlantic alliance, which includes the United States and Western Europe, is a very strong military entity. Internal contradictions do exist, but these are not so widespread or tense as to threaten this entity with destruction. Therefore, to play on these contradictions would be futile. However, besides the common interests that bind the West European countries to the United States, these countries have purely European interests as well as their own national interests. It is here that the broad field of Soviet-West European contacts unfolds, especially since the Soviet Union sees the countries of Western Europe as sovereign and equal partners in working out a common European policy and respects their lawful interests.

At the same time, one must not forget that between the USSR and those countries with which talks have been held, serious differences of opinion do exist on a wide range of problems, ranging from Euromissiles to human rights.

I believe that the nature of the relations offered by the Soviet Union to the West Europeans should impress them, for relations of this type with our country raises the prestige of Western Europe. It is no secret that the United States is still building its West European policy on the concept formulated by General Pershing as far back as World War I. Having landed on European soil, the general said at that time: We have come not for the sake of Europeans but for the sake of Americans, for our own sake. Remember this well: The U.S. front line of defense cuts across European territory. It is noteworthy that the missiles deployed by the United States in Western Europe bear the name of that very general, Pershing.

Threat of 'Nuclear Catastrophe'

OW310931 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 30 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Yevdokimov commentary from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] [Yevdokimov] Hello comrades. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech at the ceremony in Vladivostok aroused great interest throughout the world. In the reports and commentaries of foreign information agencies, special attention is being paid to the foreign policy part of the speech in which, as is noted, the firm and unchanging position of the Soviet Union to achieve the liquidation of the nuclear threat and to lower tension at flashpoints throughout the world is reaffirmed.

Many commentators note that the USSR proposals spring from Moscow's deep concern for the fate of mankind, since a nuclear war would lead to a worldwide catastrophe. At the same time it is stressed that Washington's position on the question of war and peace is once again under fire. The U.S. ASSOCIATED PRESS cites Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's remark that the U.S. ruling circles are blocking Moscow's effort to implement arms control.

The broad and realistic program to strengthen peace in the Asian-Pacific region is being evaluated as an event of extraordinary importance and an important contribution to a change for the better in the international situation. BTA, the Bulgarian news agency, notes that the USSR has offered this region to take part in the creation of a universal system for international security. It stressed that the readiness of the USSR to strengthen and broaden relations with the countries of Asia and the Pacific basin attests to its sincere interest in a relaxation of tension and in developing truly equitable cooperation with all states.

The importance of the decision to recall to the motherland six Soviet regiments from Afghanistan by the end of the current year is pointed out. The commentaries note that by taking such important steps the Soviet Union aspires to accelerate political normalization around Afghanistan.

Speaking in Vladivostok, Comrade Gorbachev said: Events of great importance are taking place before our eyes; understanding of the need for peace for all is breaking through the consciousness of people even in places where governments continue to regard weapons and war as political means. Foreign responses to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's speech once again attest to this.

Asian Nuclear Deployments

LD301746 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 30 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 30 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

The Soviet Union addressed a new call for cooperation for the sake of peace and security to all countries of the Asian-Pacific region. Speaking in Vladivostok, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev said that everyone who is striving for these goals, who hopes for a better future for their peoples will find Soviet people to be benevolent interlocutors and honest partners.

The Soviet leader's call should be viewed not only as a confirmation of serious attention that the Soviet Union as an Asian and Pacific power pays to the situation in the region which is of national and state interest for it. This call is a result of profound awareness of war danger that heightens in the area.

The build up of nuclear arms poses a particular threat to peoples of the region. The United States deployed nuclear warheads in one of the crisis zones, on the Korean peninsula. Nuclear delivery vehicles are stationed in Japan and some other countries. The number of attack atomic submarines of the "Los Angeles" type in the Pacific increased over the past year. Since June 1984, they are being equipped with "Tomahawk" cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. They were supplemented with four submarines of the "Ohio" type, armed with intercontinental missiles, the new atomic aircraft carrier "Carl Vinson", the "New Jersey" battleship with "Tomahawk" nuclear missiles, ect.

The deployment and movement of these means of first nuclear strike close to the Soviet Far East, large-scale provocative exercises with their participation held close to the shores of the USSR and other countries heightened the risk of a nuclear conflict, creating an immediate threat also for those countries which Washington chose as its nuclear hostages.

The awareness of the danger of this situation prompts countries of the region to take steps aimed at averting the threat of nuclear holocaust. This is indicated by such facts as proclaiming by 13 states a nuclear free zone in the southern part of the Pacific, the proposal of the DPRK for the creation of such a zone in the Korean peninsula, the concept of the creation of a nuclear free zone in South East Asia advanced by Indonesia, broad movement for the elimination of nuclear weapons and a ban on all its tests that has been launched in a number of countries in the region.

And finally, the idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace that is gaining the ground despite the obstacles put by Washington.

Declaring for spreading the process for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security to the Asian-Pacific region, the Soviet Union takes into consideration in full measure the expectation of the peoples of the region and the positive experience of the past -- the Pancha Shila and Bandung principles, armistice in Korea and the 1954 Geneva conference on Indochina, the Indian-Pakistani agreement concluded in Tashkent, and so on. It is not accidental that the call for common sense in the solution of the task of ensuring peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region, that came from Vladivostok, was met with satisfaction by broad public of countries of the region.

Soviet Asia-Pacific Role

PM010850 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Jul 86 First Edition p 1

[Anatoliy Krasikov "International Review": "For a Partnership of Reason"]

[Text] These days the world public and mass information media are widely discussing the speech delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, when conferring the Order of Lenin on Vladivostok. Particular attention is quite naturally being devoted to the Asian and Pacific Ocean aspect of the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

In his speech M.S. Gorbachev recalled that the Helsinki process of dialogue, talks, and agreements is in operation in Europe -- whether badly or well. This is introducing a certain stability and reduces the likelihood of armed conflicts. In Asia, however, there is no such process of virtually no such process. If anything has changed recently, it has not been for the better. Hence the proposal -- even if not an immediate goal -- to hold a Pacific Ocean conference along the lines of Helsinki with the participation of all countries connected with the ocean and to include the Asia and Pacific Ocean region in the general process of forming an all-embracing international security system, which was discussed at the 27th CPSU Congress.

There is absolutely no doubt that military and political detente in the Pacific Ocean region would be helped by constructive talks on reducing the activity of military fleets in the Pacific, primarily the activity of ships equipped with nuclear munitions. Stabilization of the regional situation would be considerably helped by limiting confrontation in the sphere of antiship weapons and, in particular, by concluding an agreement on refraining from antiship activity in zones stipulated by the agreement.

It was noted in Vladivostok that the Soviet Union attaches great significance to reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Asia to the limits of reasonable sufficiency and to constructively discussing confidence building measures and the question of the nonuse of force. Things could be set in motion by adopting measures on the security of maritime lines of communication and also on the prevention of terrorist activity here, for example.

We have always and will continue to favor placing a reliable barrier in the way of the proliferation and stockpiling of nuclear munitions in Asia and the Pacific Ocean region. It is well known that the Soviet Union has pledged not to build up medium-range nuclear missiles east of the Urals. However, our partners must meet us halfway. In a word, everything possible must be done to prevent the Pacific Ocean from being turned into a fuel tank ready to ignite at any moment.

The USSR sincerely tries to build relations with all states in the Pacific Ocean region more dynamically. As M.S. Gorbachev noted, the Soviet Union will, of course, continue to comprehensively develop relations with its friends: Mongolia, the DPRK, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. In our view, no insuperable obstacles prevent establishing equal, mutually acceptable relations between the Indochinese and ASEAN countries.

The USSR has no territorial claims on anyone. We have no intention of imposing our way of thinking and lifestyle on other peoples and states. It is our profound belief that war in general must be removed from people's lives. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union is prepared to take serious steps to stimulate and consolidate the detente process in Asia. At present, for example, in conjunction with the Mongolian leadership our government is examining the question of withdrawing a considerable proportion of Soviet troops from Mongolia. A serious measure? Without doubt. Also indisputable is the fact that the edifice of detente cannot be built in Asia with one pair of hands. This is a collective task requiring the efforts of all interested parties.

We are aware mankind is at a difficult, dramatic stage. But we are also aware of something else: It has reserves of endurance which make it possible not only to survive but also to learn to live in a new, civilized world, to live without the threat of war, in conditions of freedom, when the highest criterion if all will be the good of man and the maximum disclosure of human potential.

It is characteristic that it is precisely in Asia, with its ancient history, rich culture, and loyalty to the ideals of humanism common to all mankind, that the concept of nonalignment has taken shape and been comprehensively developed. Rejecting imperialist diktat and neocolonialism in all its ugliness, the countries belonging to the nonaligned movement urge peoples to joint struggle. Against what? First and foremost, against hunger, poverty, and illiteracy -- these plagues of the 20th century. The well-tried and acknowledged leader of the movement is great India, and our friendly relations with this country have undoubtedly been a stabilizing factor on both an all-Asian and a world scale.

Relations between the USSR and PRC have noticeably improved recently. The Soviet Union -- and this was stated in particular in Vladivostok -- is ready to hold very serious discussions with China at any time and at any level on the question of additional measures to create an atmosphere of real good-neighborliness. Cooperation in economic development would help build bilateral relations between our countries. We understand the goal set by the Chinese leadership -- to modernize the country and build in the long term a comprehensively developed socialist society.

Of course, there are serious opponents to peace and detente. The main opponent is the U.S. military-industrial complex, which makes fabulous profits from the arms race and preparation for war. Yesterday it swallowed up millions, today it devours billions, and tomorrow it counts on taking trillions of dollars.

It is clear that fully resolving security issues in the Pacific Ocean region without the participation of the United States, which is a great Pacific Ocean power, is impossible. But, unfortunately, as yet the White House has not shown sufficient interest in serious dialogue on this subject. Without any doubt, the Soviet proposal on eliminating both American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe serves as a catalyst for the process of detente in the region. Not transferring them from one place to another but really eliminating them!

It is no secret that some are actively spreading the rumor that Moscow is building up its armed might in the East. In this connection the Soviet Union states it is not doing and will not do anything above the minimum requirements for the defense and protection of our friends and allies.

The American leadership has been sufficiently informed on our principled approach to relations with Washington. We favor peaceful, good-neighborly, and equal relations and mutually profitable cooperation, for which, incidentally, there is considerable potential both in the Far East and in the Pacific.

In short, we are far from seeing an enemy in everyone who leads a different lifestyle than ours. What is more, we strive to have a better knowledge of how other peoples live, what their achievements are, and what positive contribution they have made and are making to the history of civilization. In other words, we favor mutually profitable exchange and cooperation between all countries, irrespective of their social systems. Fortunately, there are also people like this in the capitalist countries, people who do not see us as enemies but as partners. They take a realistic view of things, do not suffer from anticommunist paranoia, and do not connect themselves with profits from the arms race. Like all normal people, they also want peace. And this creates an opportunity to seek ways of improving international relations in the foreseeable future. It is precisely for this reason, for example, that signs of a turn for the better are appearing in bilateral relations with Japan. In Vladivostok M.S. Gorbachev stressed that it would be good if this change were to take place. However, we cannot but be concerned by the Japanese leadership's covert departure from the peace-loving tenets recorded in the constitution of the land of the rising sun.

Particularly discussed in Vladivostok was the problem surrounding Afghanistan, where American dollars provoke a conflict situation and fuel the undeclared war against the people of this country. Acting totally in accordance with the foreign policy course evolved by the April plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union is taking another unilateral step to reduce tension in Central Asia: six regiments will be returned to the motherland from Afghanistan by the end of 1986. However, this cannot per se settle the situation that now surrounds Afghanistan. The curtailment of foreign intervention in this country's affairs must come in response to the USSR's unilateral step.

It must be said quite clearly once again: We have not had and do not have any intention to drive a wedge between the United States and its partners, wherever the latter may be -- in Western Europe or in the Pacific Ocean region and Asia. Every state is free to choose its own friends and allies. We do not demand of other states that they pay for improving relations with us by falling out with the Americans. But does this really mean that blind emulation of every new turn in Washington policy by this or that leader can be taken as something that goes without saying?

The time has come to understand that "first law" has become an irrevocable thing of the past. To stop ourselves from sliding toward worse, we must mobilize all the potential there is in the world for common sense and a partnership of reason.

Asian CSCE Urged

PM311531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jul 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by G. Kim, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, under the general heading "Peace--the Common Concern": "A Scientist's Opinion"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok is of exceptionally great significance for the implementation of the Soviet concept of peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region. It touches on key problems which could become the basis for the development of multifaceted cooperation among the countries located there.

Tremendous significance is attached to the ideas of establishing broad economic and cultural cooperation among the countries of the Asian-Pacific region. It is true that states with different levels of development of industry and agriculture exist there. In short, with complementary economies, which creates a very favorable foundation for real cooperation.

In this context the Soviet Union's proposal on creating joint, mixed enterprises and on joint business undertakings to exploit the natural resources of Siberia and the Far East is of great interest. The implementation of these ideas will create new opportunities for economic cooperation, economic collaboration among the countries of the Asian-Pacific region. On this basis it would be possible to strengthen future ties between our country and a major Asian power like Japan and to establish favorable economic contacts with the Southeast Asian countries.

For us Soviet people, the words about the need to further develop cooperation and friendly relations with that great Asian country, the PRC are very inspiring. It is very important to remove issues which have long hampered the expansion of cooperation between our countries.

I particularly wish to speak of the prospects of convening a Pacific conference on the Helsinki model. Such a conference could establish the necessary norms for mutual relations between countries in that vast region so as to make it possible to create, step by step, the conditions for peace and peaceful development of the countries located there. This would help to eliminate military confrontation and ensure lasting peace on the planet, so that mankind greets the 21st century without weapons of mass destruction, without fear for the future, in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1502

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S PETROVSKIY ON SOVIET INTERNATIONAL SECURITY POLICIES

AU070501 Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in
Russian No 6 Jun 86 (signed to press 13 May 86) pp 3-13

[Article by V. Petrovskiy: "The Soviet Concept of General Security"]

[Text] Having presented mankind with the potential of controlling the nucleus of the atom and penetrating outer space, the 20th century will undoubtedly enter history as the beginning of the nuclear and space age. At the same time it will also be recorded by history as the century of an unprecedented paradox connected with the fact that both of these scientific-technological achievements, which have unprecedentedly expanded the horizons of progress of the earth's people, have also created a mortal threat to the very conditions for their further existence.

Today it is not only the circumstances that the current century is inexorably approaching its end and the dawn of the third millenium is already breaking that represents a compelling reason for reflection on this paradox. Serious reflection is prompted primarily by the fact that in the first half of the eighties mankind was confronted with an extraordinarily complicated development of the international situation that threatened to grow into an all-annihilating nuclear conflict. The thinking and practice that have been dominant in international relations for centuries are clearly incapable of getting the better of the problems of the contemporary world which is full of contradictions and interdependent, especially in the face of dangers engendered by the nuclear and space age. In order to ensure today that the unique spaceship, the earth, our common home will be able to continue its flight in time and space, politicians and public workers must realize the full extent of the significance of Albert Einstein's statement that contemporary weapons require a new way of thinking if mankind is to survive and continue to develop in a progressive manner. It follows from this that, without shutting one's eyes to the continued social, political, and ideological contradictions, it is necessary to master the science and art of acting in the international arena in keeping with new demands, with restraint and circumspection, and to live in a civilized manner, that is, under the conditions of correct international contacts and cooperation.

The need for a new way of thinking and for bringing politics into harmony with international reality is now recognized by many people. The new way of thinking and conduct in international affairs must be exemplified in the language of practical politics and in concrete actions of individual states within the world arena.

I

The Soviet Union has embraced and is implementing a new concept of just and secure peace. It has been presented in a condensed form in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and

in the Political Report of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Theory and practice, politics and morals, and national and general human interests are merged within an indissoluble unity in this concept.

The starting point of this concept is the realization of the fact that, as a result of the effect of new economic and scientific-technological factors, a contradictory world is evolving through the struggle of opposites, a world that is, at the same time, interdependent and, in many respects, integral, a world whose security requires the formation of a reliable security system.

The Soviet leadership proceeds in its approach to security, first and foremost, from the premise that no state whatsoever can entertain the illusion that it is possible to protect itself with military-technological means alone or even by creating [sozdaniye] the most powerful defense either on earth or in outer space.

Of course peace under the present conditions is objectively maintained by the approximate military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. However, security cannot be built indefinitely on the fear of retribution, that is, on the doctrines of "deterrence" or "intimidation." The present level of the balance of nuclear potentials of the opposing sides is too high and it makes peace fragile and precarious.

It is impossible to agree with the claim that nuclear weapons allegedly represent an irreplaceable guarantor of peace. Like other factors determining the balance, they do fulfill a certain deterrent role under the conditions of equilibrium. But the price for this is a constant and ever increasing danger that the "guarantor" of peace will turn one day into its grave digger.

The doctrines of the "balance of fear" and of "deterrence," based on the nuclear factor, are essentially aimed at escalating the arms race and intensifying the danger of nuclear war. Indeed, a close scrutiny of the logic -- if I may be permitted to use this term -- of these doctrines indicates that it amounts to a belief that each side should seek its own security by creating its own potential of a first nuclear strike. It follows then that the more weapons there exist and the more probable it becomes that they will wipe the human race off the face of the earth, the more reliable is the security which is ensured for all and everyone.

In other words, not to mention the absurdity and amorality of this situation in which mankind turns out to be a captive of accident, these doctrines encourage an increase in the arsenals of death. And, as the experience already gained in the nuclear and space age shows, following this logic only increases "equal danger." Suffice it to say that whereas prior to the appearance of nuclear missile weapons entire countries and continents were able to virtually feel secure thanks to the vast ocean spaces surrounding them, today they are all equally threatened with instantaneous annihilation.

The continuation of the arms race and, even more, its extension to outer space will accelerate an already high and critical rate of stockpiling and perfecting of nuclear weapons. And in this connection the limits may be reached at which even parity will cease to be a factor of military-political deterrence. And the creation [sozdaniye] and positioning of weapons in outer space will definitely lead to further complicating and not to solving this problem. The "star wars" program most certainly does not represent an alternative to the nuclear threat but a powerful factor of its intensification.

By engendering among adventurist circles the illusion of being able to carry out the first nuclear strike with impunity, the space-based weapons would undermine the basis

of military-political deterrence. No matter how the "star wars" program may be camouflaged by its "defensive" orientation, it still represents at a minimum a "double" of nuclear weapons. The space-based weapons would not simply complement the land-based offensive nuclear potentials: In time, as they are developed [razvitiye] and perfected, they would themselves acquire the capability of inflicting the first strike aimed not only against the targets in outer space and in the atmosphere but also on land.

This would also be connected with a qualitatively new leap in the arms race, a leap that would inevitably lead to disappearance of the very concept of strategic stability, the basis of preservation of peace in the nuclear and space age. A situation would be created in which decisions, irreversible in their possible consequences, would be made essentially by electronic machines without any participation of human mind or political will and without any consideration for moral and ethical criteria. Such a development of events could lead to a general catastrophe even if the initial impulse were triggered by error, miscalculation, or technical defect of an extremely complex computer systems.

Any use of nuclear weapons will only result in a radioactive grave and not in victory over the ideological adversary, the capture of sources of raw materials, markets, or foreign lands, or the rapid increase of profits of the military-industrial complex. As Professor J. Galbraith has accurately noted, if the irreparable happens, it will not be possible to distinguish the ashes of socialism from the ashes of capitalism. The "day after" may not dawn for any of the social systems.

The following conclusion of prominent military specialists, the authors of the book "Generals Against Arms Upgrading," who have called for the renunciation of actions "based on the old mad notion of security being attainable by means of military superiority," has a weighty sound in this connection: "Anyone who understands the laws of contemporary war as we do," they point out, "is convinced that victory is impossible in such a war." Under the present conditions, subscribing to the notion that the path to security only leads through an increase in armaments can only ensure "zero security," that is, total self-annihilation for the entire world. Today security has become a political problem that can and must be solved only by political means.

Essentially, this is also applicable to solving the question of the moral aspects of this policy. The creation [sozdaniye] of and increase in new weapons, let alone their use, cannot be justified by any moral-ethical norms.

In our period the cult of strength, the cult of arms represents a fatally dangerous atavism of militarist thinking. This thinking, the "militarist civilization" in the nuclear and space age -- these very combinations of words represent a challenge to logic and ethics. For, involved are mutually exclusive and irreconcilable concepts. And, vice versa, militarism is a "black hole" that threatens to swallow the planet of man and plunge it into nonexistence. All the forces of self-preservation, creative genius, will, and morality of man must be mobilized to prevent this. This is the highest moral norm which the next century must inherit from the present one.

To ensure security it is necessary to renounce war and stop the increase of weapons of destruction. It is already impossible to win the arms race or a nuclear war itself, and objectively these cannot bring any political gains to anyone.

Furthermore, in determining the parameters of security, it is also necessary to consider the fact that, in view of the existence of nuclear weapons, the realities of the integral and mutually interdependent world in which we live are perceived, first and

foremost, at an apparent negative level, that is, in the form of a general threat to all and everyone living on earth. The global nature of this threat is capaciously expressed by concepts that have become current in international use recently such as "nuclear winter" and "nuclear night," that is, the phenomena that threaten our entire planet. The integral nature and mutual interdependence of the world determine the integral nature and mutual interdependence of security and make it urgently necessary to consider it in its universal nature,

This means that no country can any longer count on ensuring only its own security at the expense of the security of others. The security of the USSR and the United States and of the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries is tied by a single thread, the very thread by which life on earth is hanging today. It is impossible to break it without destroying oneself. Renouncing the undermining of the other side's security is the imperative of survival.

This is really a new and essentially important element that is of revolutionary significance for political thinking. The Soviet Union fully recognizes it. It would not want any change to its own advantage in the strategic balance because such a situation would intensify the suspicions of the other side and increase the instability of general situation. Preserving the adversary's feeling of security is as important as maintaining one's own security.

Mutual interdependence in the sphere of security also signifies another exceptionally important circumstance, that is, the impermissibility for anyone to set national security or security of a coalition against international security. All these concepts have become organically interconnected. In other words, both national security and security of a coalition become fictions if they do not fall within the framework of genuine general security.

The wisdom in the nuclear and space age is the wisdom of considering as paramount not only the concern for one's own security but also the concern for the security of all. It is necessary to rise precisely to this level of theoretical generalization if we really aspire to securely enter the coming third millennium.

It is appropriate in this connection to cite the following conclusion of the commission named for Olaf Palme to whom we cannot but pay a tribute of respect and remembrance: "Countries must realize that in the nuclear age states cannot ensure their own security at the expense of each other. Only joint efforts and the policy of mutual restraint of states can enable the people of the entire world to live without fear of wars and destruction, to live with hope for a secure future and prosperity for their children and for future generations."

Whereas at the international level it is a question of general security, as far as the USSR and the United States, as the two biggest powers, are concerned, it can only be a question of mutual security. The common truth must be the understanding that the security of each of them cannot be divided by giving more to one side and less to the other side. Mutual security implies mutuality both in obligations and in advantages.

At the practical level the principle of equality and identical security signifies in particular that any agreement on arms limitations and on disarmament must be strictly balanced and must be implemented in equal proportional parts in a way ensuring that at any stage of reduction of the level of military confrontation none of the sides gains any military advantage and that factual military-strategic equality and approximate parity are ensured while taking into account the geographical positions and the specific historical characteristics of the development of the military potentials of the

two powers. This is a genuinely realistic basis. It was precisely on this basis that it was possible to achieve a number of bilateral strategic arms limitation agreements in the seventies.

It can be noted with satisfaction that equal security is being recognized more and more widely in various countries of the world, regardless of their political or ideological orientations, as the only way of survival in the nuclear and space age. Thus, the heads of states of the "Delhi Six" stated in one of their recent appeals: "We all live facing the terrifying possibility of our death in nuclear flames started either by accident or by evil design. Precisely for this reason we consider it our duty to do everything in our power to avert this threat and create a new concept of general security without nuclear weapons."

II

The present Soviet concept of general security is not limited to the philosophy of survival and equal security. It proceeds from the need to immediately back political goals by the practical actions of states and by the activities of all social forces. The 27th congress' guidelines for the Soviet Union's foreign policy are that this policy should seek, find, and use, any, even the smallest chance to arrest -- while it is still possible -- the trend of increasing the military threat and replace the old order of things under which mankind is held hostage to nuclear death with the development of close and productive cooperation among the governments, parties, and social movements which are really concerned with the fate of peace on earth, and with all peoples in order to create a comprehensive system of international security.

The "Fundamental Principles" of such a system formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress represent a concretization of the new political thinking which the Soviet Union proposes to all of its partners in the international arena to adopt and to enter the 21st century with this thinking. The "Fundamental Principles" point out the shortest reliable way to solving the cardinal problems of peace and, first and foremost, such problems as those of preventing a thermonuclear war, of disarmament, and of ensuring equal security for all states. The "Fundamental Principles" represent a practical implementation of our concept of an integral and, in many respects, interdependent world. The "Fundamental Principles" represent a program that is truly global and comprehensive both in its geographical scope and in the range of the problems with which it deals. In its generalized and, at the same time, very concrete form it takes into account the fundamental interests of all states and peoples -- big and small, nuclear and non-nuclear, developed and developing.

The principal novelty in the formulation of the question of formation of a security system in the nuclear and space age is expressed, first and foremost, in the comprehensive approach to international relations. Whereas earlier security was mainly reduced only to military and political areas, it is now also connected with the restructuring of interaction between states in other aspects such as, for instance, the economic and humanitarian spheres. In the world of our time with its extraordinarily complex interweaving of various interconnections, the system of general security presupposes, first and foremost, the renunciation by nuclear powers of all wars -- nuclear or conventional -- against one another or against third countries; the cessation of all nuclear weapons tests and the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons by the end of the century; the banning and annihilation of chemical weapons; and the renunciation of development of other weapons of mass extermination. Furthermore, it must include a strictly controlled reduction of the level of military potentials of states within the limits of reasonable sufficiency, the dissolution of military groupings (and, as a step toward this, renunciation of expanding the existing ones or forming new ones), and the proportional and commensurate reductions of military budgets.

Considering the political aspect of such a system of international security, the system presupposes: absolute respect in international practice for the right of every people to sovereignly choose the ways and forms of its development; ensuring just political settlements of international crises and regional conflicts as well as the elaboration of a complex of measures aimed at strengthening confidence among states and creating effective guarantees against external attacks on them; and the inviolability of their borders. A most important principle of the security system would also be the elaboration of effective methods of preventing international terrorism, including measures of safety in the use of international land, air, and sea communications.

A comprehensive system of international security naturally also signifies the observance of the universally recognized principles in the economic sphere. For instance, the establishment of the new international economic system guaranteeing equal economic security for all states should have an essential role in this connection. International economic security can become a reliable fulcrum of general security along with disarmament.

The foundations of security must also be strengthened in the humanitarian sphere, including by means of cooperation in spreading the ideas of peace and disarmament. In particular, it is necessary to eradicate genocide and racial discrimination and broaden cooperation in the implementation of human rights while respecting the laws of each individual country:

The concept of a comprehensive security system advanced by the Soviet Union is profoundly humanist in its nature. Its goal is not to "make" mankind "happy" by imposing on it a utopian scheme but to embody in life the fundamental interests of all peoples of our planet and to achieve peaceful coexistence as the universal principle of interstate relations.

It follows from this that the concern for the survival of the human race is above national egoism and interests and above differences in ideologies and world outlooks. Interstate relations can only be realized along the course of peaceful competition and cooperation and ideological contradictions must be taken out of this sphere. In the nuclear and space age there is no other possibility for the development of fruitful relations between states.

History has placed before mankind the question of peace not simply as a question of absence of war but as a question of a world without weapons and violence in which every people would live under just and secure conditions and freely determine its own fate. This is why it is vitally necessary to create a comprehensive security that would not only make it possible to avoid wars, both nuclear and conventional, but also to eliminate in general the threat of direct or indirect violence on global or regional scales in the military and political as well in the economic or humanitarian spheres.

III

To ensure that the system of general security will function effectively it is necessary to provide a reliable structure of guarantees which would withstand any changes in the international climate and ensure the confidence that peaceful coexistence will continue to stand as the highest principle of interstate relations under any and all circumstances.

Direct guarantees that weapons and, first and foremost, nuclear weapons will not be used must provide the supporting fulcrum of the entire security structure. Thus, disarmament

assumes decisive importance. Direct guarantees are provided by concrete actions for the elimination of the threat of war, for the limitation of arms and for disarmament, and for peaceful settlements and prevention of international conflicts. The process toward disarmament, it is noted in the UN research on interconnections between disarmament and international security, will strengthen international security by creating the conditions that will enable the UN member-states to take steps to reduce tension, to settle disputes by peaceful means, and to become engaged in joint actions aimed at preventing wars from breaking out. By reducing and, in the final analysis, liquidating the material basis for waging wars, disarmament would help create a situation in which, instead of counting on the possibility of the use of force for ensuring their security, states would employ exclusively peaceful means to solve their problems and disputes. Thus, the UN experts conclude, disarmament represents the main and the most important factor in the cause of strengthening international security.

It is theoretically and practically incorrect to counterpose disarmament to another direct guarantee of security, that is, the settlement of conflicts. Such an approach shows an unwillingness to provide both the former and the latter guarantees, in other words, it shows a reliance on weapons and military force in relations with other countries. It is perfectly obvious that ensuring international law and order liquidating regional conflicts on just principles and as soon as effectively as possible would really help to make progress in the cause of limiting and reducing arms.

The same dialectical connection exists between the problems of disarmament and confidence. Essentially, these are two parallel processes. The former prevents military preparations and acts as a direct material guarantee of security. The latter influences the international political atmosphere and helps reduce the danger of war. On the whole, disarmament and confidence mutually support one another and act as guarantors of security.

The measures aimed at bringing the structure of international economic relations into accord with the requirements of general security also have an especially significant place among the guarantees that create the conditions which, if they do not exclude, they in any case hinder to a maximum extent the use of force by one state against another. The formation of a system of economic security is inseparable from actions aimed at eliminating violence, threats, diktats, and discrimination from international relations.

The legal formulation of guarantees is of great importance from the viewpoint of establishing a system of guarantees. In this connection two types of guarantees, that is, political and international law guarantees stand out. In the case of the former it is a question of the obligations assumed by states under documents that set forth the political intentions of states (the documents such as the Final Act of the all-European conference and the final documents of special sessions of the UN General Assembly on disarmament) and in the case of the latter it is a question of obligations incorporated in the documents of a juridically mandatory nature (for instance, the UN Charter). The norms and principles of contemporary international law act as the normative guarantees of security. Despite all their differences, both types of guarantees represent two sides of the same coin, that is, of the complex of political and legal guarantees. In this connection it is especially important to emphasize the need for all states to most strictly and scrupulously fulfill their assumed obligations and to strictly adhere to the spirit and letter of international agreements.

A reliable system of general security is impossible without a proper moral and psychological atmosphere, without educating the peoples in the spirit of peace, tolerance, and mutual respect, and without introducing everywhere the political mentality that makes the cultivation of militarism, hatred, and violence impossible.

IV

The human intellect and the enormous potential of peace existing on the planet today are capable of finding the right itinerary and provide the impulse to progress along the road to secure peace. This is the road of detente. The true substance of detente lies in the elimination of dangerous tension, the renunciation of reliance on the methods of force in the conduct of international affairs, and the recognition of the legitimate rights and interests of partners in international contacts.

Detente is not a goal unto itself and it is not a static but a dynamic phenomenon and process, and cooperation in all spheres of relations expands and is filled with ever new contents as this process continues to deepen. The code of its principles is set forth in the Helsinki Final Act signed by the European states and the United States and Canada, and it is also contained in the declaration of the UN General Assembly on deepening and consolidating the relaxation of international tension which was adopted by all member-states in 1977.

On 15 January 1986 the Soviet Union set forth a program of general security. The liquidation of nuclear weapons by stages everywhere and forever by the year 2000, in conjunction with an effective prohibition of space-based strike weapons, represents the central element of this plan. In this formulation of the question the liquidation of nuclear weapons appears not as a utopia but as a completely realistic schedule of clearly outlined measures calculated for an historically short term of 15 years.

The attitude toward this problem is most openly revealed in connection with the question of nuclear explosions. Refraining from conducting these explosions means putting an end to perfecting nuclear weapons and to creating new types of nuclear weapons, and then starting to make practical progress toward liquidating nuclear arsenals.

The Soviet Union defends the course of maximum speed in working out an international agreement on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests and of using for this purpose any mechanism of negotiations, be it the mechanism of bilateral Soviet-American negotiations, of trilateral negotiations with the participation of the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain, or of multilateral negotiations within the disarmament conference. What is involved in this connection is an agreement involving strict and reliable verification [kontrol], including on-site inspection [inspektsiya na mestakh] and the utilization of all achievements of seismology. It would be absurd to get bogged down in disputes about what must be considered first, verification [kontrol] or the prohibition of tests itself. It is obvious that it is necessary to advance along all directions.

An accord on the complete reciprocal liquidation of the USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone could represent a most important step as early as in the immediate future. The Soviet Union proposes not to deploy them in other regions but to physically destroy them. As far as the nuclear forces of Britain and France are concerned, not counting their nuclear arms represents a compromise version. At the same time it is impossible not to see that the further quantitative increase and modernization of these armaments would be contrary to the task of lowering the level of nuclear confrontation.

The Soviet program of general security through disarmament goes far beyond the idea of a nuclear-free world. It envisages the prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons, and it envisages not only the elimination of these weapons but also the liquidation of the industrial base for their manufacture. Just as in relation to nuclear

weapons, it is proposed to solve the question of chemical weapons within a historically short period, that is, by the end of this century. The Soviet Union raises the question of completing in the next year or two the agreement [soglasovaniye] on an international convention on the total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, a convention that would lend itself to monitoring [proverka]. The Soviet Union meets its partners in negotiations halfway precisely in the spheres where serious differences exist concerning the deadlines for announcing the locations of installations for the production of chemical weapons as well as concerning the verification [kontrol] of their closure and liquidation.

According to the Soviet security program, the liquidation of nuclear and chemical weapons must be accompanied by corresponding stabilizing reductions of conventional weapons.

The USSR's new proposals in the sphere of prohibition of chemical weapons were set forth at the Geneva Disarmament Conference on 22 April 1986. The essence of these proposals is:

The destruction of the stocks of chemical weapons would be commenced by every participant state no later than 6 months and would be completed no later than 10 years after the convention comes into effect.

Thirty days after the convention comes into effect the participant states would issue official declarations that they have (or had) such production installations in their territories, and on the quantity of these installations regardless in whose ownership (state or private) these installations are (or were) and regardless on whose orders they have been built and are operated (were operated) for the purpose of producing chemical weapons, and they would declare the exact location of every such installation.

The destruction or dismantling of installations for the production of chemical weapons would start not later than 1 year after the convention comes into effect.

Every participant state, immediately after the convention comes into effect, would halt all activity at installations for the production of chemical weapons, except the activity necessary for their closure, and would issue an official declaration on this action not later than 30 days after the convention comes into effect.

During the 3-month period after the convention comes into effect, every participant state would take national measures to ensure the non-operation (that is, the closure) of these installations taking into account their separate or their combined location with other production installations.

The procedures for destroying or dismantling the appropriate installations would be worked out by taking into account their character and specific peculiarities.

The destruction of installations for the production of chemical weapons would imply the physical destruction of all technological equipment for the last stage of synthesis of highly toxic lethal chemical agents and of the special equipment for filling chemical ammunition. The process of dismantling these installations would involve working out the main assembly units of equipment and their mandatory destruction. Some types of equipment could be used in other chemical production operations under the conditions of strict guarantees that they are not used for prohibited purposes.

The cessation of operations of installations for weapons production, including private enterprises and transnational corporations, would be ensured by strict verification [kontrol], including systematic international on-site verification [proverka].

Systematic international verifications [proverka] with the presence of inspectors would be conducted in connection with the destruction and dismantling of installations for the production of chemical weapons; and the observance of the convention would be ensured both in relation to the state and to private enterprises and the use of commercial chemical production operations for the production of chemical weapons would also not be allowed.

Striving to achieve real progress in the sphere of conventional weapons, the Soviet Union has taken a new initiative. Speaking at the 11th SED Congress, M. S. Gorbachev proposed to come to an agreement on a significant reduction of all components of ground forces and tactical air forces of the European states as well as of the corresponding forces of the United States and Canada which are stationed in Europe and, as the Soviet leader pointed out, the geographical zone of this reduction obviously must be the entire European territory from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Each of the concrete actions proposed by the Soviet Union for limiting the arms race must be accompanied by verification [kontrol] measures, including -- in necessary cases -- on-site verification [inspektsiya]. It is intended that the verification [kontrol] will be sufficient to ensure compliance with agreements by all sides.

Naturally, the disarmament process will inevitably result in releasing material and intellectual resources for constructive purposes. The existing order of things -- armaments instead of development -- must be replaced by a new order of things -- disarmament for development. It is essential that every concrete action of materially narrowing or limiting the sphere of military preparations, including especially those connected with nuclear weapons, be accompanied by allotment of material resources for constructive purposes, including aid to developing countries.

Arms limitation and disarmament represent the main areas for laying the foundations of general security. However, these areas are far from exhausting all highways on the map of roads leading to secure peace. Progress in the political, economic, and humanitarian spheres acquires paramount significance in this connection.

For instance, the development of large-scale cooperation in the conquest and exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all peoples could become the most promising sphere. Such cooperation would represent the real alternative to a new twist in the arms race connected with the extension to outer space. Approaching the frontier of the third millennium, mankind is able to undertake major projects in such cooperation, including the projects of joint creation [sozdaniye] and application of advanced space technology in the interests of science, production, and economic development. This would signify an efficient utilization of the resources and potentials of all countries and of all mankind.

V

The creation of secure peace is unthinkable without broad and constructive interaction of states and without coordination of their positions and actions for the purpose of achieving their common goals. All international organizations and negotiation mechanisms must

be enlisted for accomplishing this task, taking into account, of course, the specific nature of their activities. The creation of comprehensive security requires the maximal utilization and -- wherever and whenever necessary -- the creation of new international mechanisms and institutions that would make it possible to find the optimal correlation between the national and state interests and the general interests of mankind.

Such a universal organ of multilateral cooperation as the United Nations, whose goals and tasks, as defined by its Charter and the UN decisions adopted on its basis, are essentially also the goals and tasks of progress to a just and secure peace, acquires a special significance within the system of international organizations.

It is necessary to fully utilize and obtain full returns from the entire potential and authority of the United Nations to enable the peoples to enter the third millennium as truly united nations. As the center of coordination of actions of states, the United Nations is called upon to actively participate in the formation of a comprehensive system of international security. In addition to this, it is also a ready-made instrument of maintaining peace. The Security Council has the right to take decisions that are mandatory for all states and, especially important, also the right to take the appropriate concrete actions to maintain and restore peace.

The United Nations was founded in the prenuclear era. The world has passed through major changes since then. Of course, these changes cannot but be reflected in the United Nations. It is obvious that, as the process of democratization of international relations and creation of a comprehensive security system advances further, the United Nations will also continue to be perfected. The appearance of a world free from nuclear weapons will also make new claims on it. However, one thing is beyond all dispute: In the long term the role of the United Nations as the political guarantor of general security will grow more and more.

Raising the coefficient of the useful effect of the existing mechanism of negotiations on the limitation and reduction of arms assumes an extraordinary importance in the process of formation of secure peace. What is needed are active efforts to give a fresh impulse to the Geneva negotiations between the USSR and the United States on nuclear and space weapons, to the Disarmament Conference, also working in Geneva, to the Stockholm conference, and to the Vienna negotiations.

The goal of all of these forums is to curtail the arms race and strengthen confidence between states. The approach to these negotiations, just as the approach to all international affairs as a whole, must combine firmness in defending the principles and interests of general security with readiness for mutually acceptable compromises and for searching for the balance of interests. Orientation to dialogue and mutual understanding and not to confrontation is required.

The nuclear powers that are moreover also permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility for the world situation. Precisely they must demonstrate political will and take concrete actions to halt the material preparations for nuclear war and ensure the reduction of nuclear potentials by stages to zero. The Soviet proposal to leaders of other nuclear powers to gather at the round table also proceeds from this. Serious steps on the road to secure peace could result from such a meeting.

Of course, in considering the problem of creation of a comprehensive system of international security, it is necessary to take into account the state and future prospects of

relations between the two greatest powers, the USSR and the United States. Although in the contemporary mutually interdependent world it is wrong to view world politics only through the prism of Soviet-American relations, the significance of these relations for the preservation of peace must not be underestimated. The differences in social systems and ideologies should not lead to tension between the USSR and the United States. Objective prerequisites exist for arranging fruitful and mutually beneficial Soviet-American cooperation in various areas. The policies of both powers must be oriented to mutual understanding and not to animosity.

Mutual restraint and a genuinely civilized approach to the most acute political problems of the world are needed here. But for the time being the U.S. Administration's actions in the international arena -- the brigand-like attack on Libya, the intensification of threats against Nicaragua, and the stubborn continuation of nuclear tests -- unambiguously attest to Washington's attachment to the militarist and aggressive course. As M.S. Gorbachev has pointed out in this connection, "these actions also directly harm the dialogue between the USSR and the United States and between the East and West as a whole. And this should not be made to appear as though it were supposedly unknown to the American administration that Soviet-American relations cannot develop independently of the way the United States conducts itself in the international arena and of the situation that results from this conduct."

The creation of a comprehensive system of international security requires the united efforts of states and peoples. There should be no detached observers in this task.

In the contemporary conditions the time allowed for the search for political accords has been sharply reduced and there is a crying need for quicker constructive actions.

The necessary prerequisites, considerable positive experience, and the mechanism of international interaction are all there to start the progress toward secure peace already today. What is all the more needed then are the political will of participants in international contacts, the demonstration of a sense of responsibility by the leaders of states, and the overcoming of inertia, routine attitudes, and obsolete approaches and stereotypes which are still proving themselves among some people to be stronger than steel.

The human factor of world politics acquires an extraordinary significance in the present tense situation. It is necessary to recognize the new realities and bring the political thinking and actions in the international arena into accord with them. Undertaking together the task of forming a comprehensive system of international security -- this is the imperative of the contemporary period.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda"
"Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1986

/12858
CSO: 5200/1500

RELATED ISSUES

REPORTS, COMMENTARY ON VISIT TO MOSCOW BY FRG'S GENSCHER

Meets Nitze Before Leaving

LD201043 Hamburg DPA in German 1010 GMT 20 Jul 86

[Excerpt] Bonn 20 Jul (DPA) -- Immediately prior to his departure by airplane for a 3-day official visit to Moscow, Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher met Paul Nitze, U.S. President Ronald Reagan's special envoy to the Geneva disarmament negotiations, on Sunday. In the conversation at Cologne-Bonn airport, Genscher was briefed on the latest state of the U.S.-Soviet disarmament negotiations. [passage omitted]

Arms Talks Highlighted

LD211146 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 21 Jul 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Viktor Levin]

[Text] You probably already know about the arrival in Moscow of FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. Talks will begin today and are expected to continue on Tuesday.

Before his departure for the Soviet capital, the head of the FRG foreign policy department paid a brief visit to Paris, where he talked with French President Mitterrand about his trip to the Soviet Union; he also met Nitze, Reagan's envoy at the Geneva disarmament talks, at the airport. It is reported that Genscher asked about the U.S. position at the Soviet-U.S. negotiations in light of the latest proposals put forward by the two sides. In addition, Genscher expressed his view on the forthcoming negotiations in Moscow. In an interview given to Sueddeutsche Rundfunk, he declared that he would strive to do everything in his power to improve relations between the Soviet Union and the FRG. Genscher made it clear that the FRG aspires to take an active part in the East-West dialogue.

Meeting With Gorbachev

LD211843 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received in the Kremlin today the deputy federal chancellor, FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who conveyed to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee a message from Helmut Kohl, the federal chancellor.

An extensive range of questions pertaining to the international and, above all, to the general European situation and bilateral relations were discussed. The good-natured [dobrozhelatelnyy] exchange of common understanding that the situation in the world remains alarming, that there has so far been no forward movement at the nuclear arms talks that would make it possible to say that the military threat has been decreased, that a genuinely constructive and successful dialogue between West and East is essential, that the treaties that have been concluded, the SALT and ABM ones first and foremost, should be observed, and that the forthcoming all-European forums and other talks are called upon to help set up a structure of steady interaction and cooperation between states.

The interlocutors confirmed the adherence of their states to the 1971 Moscow Treaty and to the Helsinki Final Act which form the basis of Soviet-West German relations and of their participation in the pan-European process.

Its continuation requires that equal attention be paid to all aspects; to the political, military, economic, cultural, and humanitarian aspects.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted that in the situation that has taken shape in the world, in Europe, and in bilateral FRG-USSR relations, the present meeting -- Genscher's visit -- exceeded the usual limit. The world now stands at a crossroads. The direction it will take depends, to a large extent, on Europe's political position.

Comrade Gorbachev emphasized the mutual responsibility of states such as the USSR and the FRG in the construction of their European home taking into account the lessons of history, their position, and the real weight they carry in Europe and the world, naturally retaining allegiance to their military and political alliances.

Putting in the forefront the question of European cooperation we proceed from the fact that a violation of the political and territorial structure that has taken shape in Europe will only lead to chaos and to a worsening of the situation. However, by remaining what it represents, Europe can and should make a contribution of its own to the formulation of a new political thinking, to the solving of problems of universal human significance, and to making the general situation a healthier one. This contribution is especially valuable since it would represent a result of combined and joint efforts of states with different systems and would be based upon an enormous political experience, upon the economic, scientific, technological, and other potential of the Europeans.

Taking cognizance of the FRG representatives' peaceloving statements, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted the manifestations of inconsistency in FRG policies.

Utterances favoring a responsible approach [vzglyad] to the current world situation and to the FRG's role do not tally with the practical support for the bellicose course of the U.S. Administration, for the American intermediate option which envisages a retention of proportion of medium-range missiles in Europe, with its participation in the SDI program, with its passive attitude to the opportunities for disarmament, opened up the far-reaching Soviet initiatives.

It is in the interests of the FRG to pursue an active policy on the disarmament question, and if it takes the form of practical steps, the FRG will find the USSR a reliable partner that will not act in a hollow manner.

The most convincing evidence of the USSR's peaceful intentions is its plans for internal transformations, aimed at opening up the entire enormous potential of the Soviet society. At this promising stage of its development the USSR is ready to cooperate with the FRG, also in the economic sphere, including new forms of interaction that could be discussed jointly. Thus, the material base of political dialogue, of interest and trust in each other will grow in strength; the process of building civilized relations, of benefit to all of Europe, will proceed in a more successful manner.

Comrade Shevardnadze and other officials were present at the meeting.

DPA on Gorbachev Meeting

LD210828 Hamburg DPA in German 0732 GMT 21 Jul 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, 21 Jul (DPA) -- Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal foreign minister, was received this morning in Moscow by Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet party leader. The main topics of the exchange of views in the Kremlin are relations between Bonn and Moscow, East-West relations, and the disarmament negotiations.

During their talk, Genscher will hand over a message from Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl. In the message, the chancellor stresses the readiness of the Federal Government to strengthen dialogue with the Soviet leadership and to improve relations in all fields. Genscher might also renew the invitation to Gorbachev to visit the Federal Republic.
[passage omitted]

Lists Main Topics

LD211315 Hamburg DPA in German 1240 GMT 21 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jul (DPA) -- Bonn and Moscow intend to improve relations, which have been strained in the past, and to look for ways of opening a "new page" in these relations. This was stated today by Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev and Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher during a 3-hour talk in Moscow. According to Genscher, Gorbachev said that the Soviet Government would and could not forget the past. However, one should now examine what scope there is for the development and expansion of relations.

The talk, which Genscher said was open, lively and very serious, was Genscher's first meeting with Gorbachev. The Kremlin chief, and also Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, have so far excluded the Federal Republic from visits to the West. Genscher said that he and Gorbachev had "not minced words" and also discussed -- apart from common concerns -- divisive positions.

The main topics, apart from German-Soviet relations, were East-West relations and the disarmament negotiations. Gorbachev apparently reiterated Moscow's sharp criticism on the Federal Republic's assent to NATO counterarmament with medium-range missiles, and Bonn's attitude toward the U.S. SDI program. Genscher defended the German positions and explained once more in detail the reasons which had led Bonn at the time to agree to counterarmament in reply to the Soviet SS-20 missiles.

Genscher Begins Shevardnadze Talks

LD211302 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT 21 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 21 TASS--Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal vice-chancellor, federal minister of foreign affairs of the FRG, began talks in Moscow today. Hans-Dietrich Genscher had arrived in Moscow Sunday for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

CW Accord Seen 'Shortly'

LD211904 Hamburg DPA in German 1810 GMT 21 Jul 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, 21 Jul (DPA) -- Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher discussed the whole range of international arms control problems in an approximately 5-hour long talk with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today. The two foreign ministers concurred that an agreement on chemical weapons will be possible shortly. The foreign ministers' talks are due to continue on Tuesday on bilateral topics. Afterwards, a scientific-technological framework agreement between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic is due to be signed. The agreement will be signed for the Federal German side by Genscher and Research Minister Heinz Riesenhuber (CDU) [Christian Democratic Union], who arrived in Moscow in the evening. [passage omitted]

Genscher Views Relations

DW212116 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1945 GMT 21 Jul 86

[Interview with FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher by correspondent Joachim Jauer in Moscow on 21 July; on the "Hwute-Journal Program"]

[Excerpt] [Jauer] Mr Minister, here in Moscow, a new page of relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union was to be opened. Has it been opened?

[Genscher] The general secretary said, let us open a new page. I agreed, and I hope the assessment of our talks on both sides will indeed lead to progress in our shaping German-Soviet relations. Shaping means the development and deepening of our relations, and naturally it also means the benefit that our relations will have for East-West relations.

[Jauer] Regarding the comprehensive topic of disarmament. Will the differences continue, or have there been any changes of opinion during your talks?

[Genscher] Two things are of importance. First, I am quite sure one understands their interlocutor's stance better after the talks than prior to them. The foreign minister made a very positive assessment of the talks with the general secretary this morning, and then we agreed that in deepened consultations we would try to find ways for our country and the Soviet Union to harmonize our views -- the views that our alliance represent, because we are and remain members of the alliances we belong to. The awareness is very strong here that the FRG and the Soviet Union have in the past made an important contribution to understanding between the East and West, and that that should also be continued.

Meetings with Shevardnadze

LD221404 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1323 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jul (TASS) -- Talks were held on 21-22 July between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, deputy federal chancellor and federal minister of foreign affairs of the FRG, who was in Moscow on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet government.

Main attention at the talks was devoted to discussion of issues of war and peace, the progress of the political dialogue between East and West, the examination of a number of topical international problems, and the state of relations between the USSR and FRG and their future prospects.

The fundamental significance of the conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Hans-Dietrich Genscher was noted, during which an evaluation of the current situation in the world was set out, as were the Soviet leadership's considerations on ways to improve the international situation.

Eduard Shevardnadze spelled out, in a concrete plan, the Soviet Union's position on a broad range of questions, primarily relating to the security sphere. There was a detailed analysis of the state of affairs at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, and attention was directed toward the fact that the Soviet Union has undertaken broad, concrete steps at the talks to make it easier to find mutually acceptable accords. Achieving them would meet not only the interests of the USSR and the United States, but also European countries and the other world states.

In this respect there was confirmation of the negative feeling toward the FRG's participation in the SDI program.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher agreed on the urgent need for substantial steps on disarmament. He stated that the new Soviet initiatives have been perceived with interest in the West. He spoke of the FRG Government's adherence to a policy of peace and of its aspiration to facilitate, within the NATO framework, a constructive dialogue with the East, and also progress at the talks being conducted on limiting and reducing arms.

On the Soviet side it was stressed that the FRG Government has at its disposal opportunities to make a contribution to the cause of limiting and reducing armaments. In particular, it could make a weighty pronouncement in favor of halting nuclear arms tests, particularly in the conditions of the current Soviet moratorium.

Issues relating to medium-range weapons were touched upon. The situation today is such that ridding Europe of the given category of weapons is of concern not only to the powers possessing them, but also of the countries on whose territory they are sited. In the event of a withdrawal of U.S. missiles from the FRG or any other state in Western Europe the Soviet Union would of course reply with identical reductions in its nuclear weapons.

Both sides expressed an opinion on the desirability for work on a convention banning chemical weapons to be completed as soon as possible, perhaps even this year. It was noted by the Soviet side that the FRG Government, by opposing these weapons, could help prevent the solution of this important issue being jeopardized by the implementation of plans to create a dangerous form of these weapons -- binary ones.

During the exchange of opinions on issues of conventional weapons, Eduard Shevardnadze drew Hans-Dietrich Genscher's attention to the recent proposals of the Warsaw Pact member countries. The hope was expressed that the Budapest appeal will not be left without a constructive response from the Western side, including the FRG.

Attaching great importance to the development and activization of the all-European process, both sides expressed themselves in favor of a successful conclusion to the Stockholm conference and an energetic meeting in Vienna of the participant states in the Helsinki conference: They are in favor of this opening at the level of foreign ministers.

The ministers set out their governments' respective approaches to the situation in the Near East, in the south of Africa, to questions concerning a political settlement around Afghanistan, and exchanged opinions on ways to normalize the situations in these regions.

Eduard Shevardnadze stressed the unchanging nature of the Soviet Union's line toward the stable development of cooperation with the FRG, given that the interests of the security of both sides are taken strictly into account. Willingness on the part of the FRG to further the solution of issues in the field of disarmament and the development of constructive cooperation on an all-European scale would open up new horizons for a political dialogue between the USSR and the FRG.

The sides spoke in favor of a search for new promising spheres of cooperation in the field of economics, and noted that there are opportunities for interaction between both countries in the cause of creating an international procedure for nuclear power engineering safety, and in the sphere of controlled thermonuclear fusion, and environmental protection.

An intergovernmental agreement on scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the FRG was signed, as well as a joint protocol on instituting general consulates -- in Munich for the USSR, and in Kiev for the FRG.

The talks passed in a business-like constructive atmosphere.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher invited Eduard Shevardnadze to visit the FRG on an official visit. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Genscher Press Conference

LD221430 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1318 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jul (TASS) -- There is a mutual stake in an expansion of relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union. We want to lay a new foundation for cooperation, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal vice chancellor and FRG federal foreign affairs minister stated. He spoke today in the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

We want to expand bilateral cooperation, the minister pointed out. This applies to an intensification of both economic and political relations. Giving an assessment of his visit and his talks with Soviet leaders, Hans-Dietrich Genscher emphasized that as a result, mutual understanding was strengthened on those issues where there is still an absence of agreement. The decision to continue our conversations is proof that both sides think that such an exchange of views is useful.

In our talks, which continued for 9 hours in all, we talked to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for 3 hours, and to Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs, for 6 hours. They were constructive in character and permeated with a striving to understand the interests of the other side, the federal vice chancellor continued. We made an agreement on scientific and technical cooperation, and signed a number of programs. In this connection, Hans-Dietrich Genscher accorded his high estimation to the agreement achieved on the establishment of consulate generals -- of the FRG in Kiev, and of the USSR in Munich. The results of the visit justify the hopes we attached to it, the FRG minister of foreign affairs stated.

Heinz Riesenhuber, FRG federal minister of research and technology, who took part in the press conference, talked about the joint West German-Soviet documents that had been signed. He stated that the development of cooperation in the field of economics, engineering and industry is a contribution to the cause of mutual understanding between peoples.

Discusses Disarmament

LD221437 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jul (TASS) -- We believe that in the nuclear age security can be ensured only by joint efforts. To this end we need cooperation in the political, economic, and other spheres. Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal vice chancellor and FRG minister of foreign affairs has stated. He spoke today at a press conference here for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Both sides, the minister continued, favor success at the talks on banning chemical weapons on a global scale, and they consider such a result attainable. We also have an interest in substantial results being achieved at the Stockholm conference by 19 September.

Speaking about disarmament problems, Hans-Dietrich Genscher indicated that the FRG is especially interested in progress at the talks on Soviet and U.S. medium-range weapons. The Federal Government, he said, has an interest in the talks between the United States and USSR, based on the outcome of last year's summit meeting in Geneva and of the meeting between the heads of the two countries foreign policy departments in January 1985, leading to a positive result.

In this connection the federal vice chancellor positively appraised the Soviet proposals on disarmament issues of 11 June, stressing that they "create a foundation for beginning the solution of existing issues."

The questions asked of Hans-Dietrich Genscher by a number of journalists concerned the ambiguous nature of the FRG's course in arms restriction and disarmament matters. In their questions, the journalists pointed out that while producing fine sounding declarations about a desire to restrain the arms race, FRG leaders are in fact continuing to follow in the wake of Washington's position on medium range missiles, on SDI, and so on. The responses from the FRG foreign minister to these questions sounded unconvincing and reflected the inconsistency in official Bonn's line.

Shevardnadze, Genscher Dinner Speeches

LD221850 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jul (TASS) -- On 22 July, Eduard Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in honor of Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

It was attended by Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Vsevolod Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Aleksey Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR ministers; and other officials.

Attending the luncheon on the FRG side were: Heinz Riesenhuber, minister of research and technology; Joerg Kastl, FRG ambassador to the USSR; and the people accompanying Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

An exchange of speeches took place.

Eduard Shevardnadze said:

We appreciate your gesture, esteemed Mr Federal Minister, in laying a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The eternal flame of this memorial is invariably in our thoughts and deeds, impelling us to act in such a way to ensure that the past not repeat itself, that peace reign finally and irrevocably on earth.

This is the essence of our foreign policy, of the new philosophy of peace and of the concept of a universal system of international security, set forth in the well-known statement by Mikhail Gorbachev and in his Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress.

This is the meaning of the ideas we have put forward at many forums, developing the Soviet plan for peace and security for Europe.

Such is our aim at talks, both present and future ones.

We are meeting with you in Moscow, which gave its name to the historic treaty between our countries. It is valuable as a document that has determined the course of both our countries toward stable cooperation, with due account being taken of each other's security interests. Moreover, the Moscow Treaty, which, in its time, required political foresight, resolve and an innovating attitude on the part of its authors, today is a synonym for goodwill that rises above prejudices, fears and lack of trust.

The conversation Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had with you yesterday is of fundamental significance for the relations between our two countries and gives a new stimulus to the USSR-FRG dialogue and to the East-West dialogue as a whole.

We have every reason to feel a certain optimism on this account, an optimism awakened by a number of tendencies and events of the recent past.

The European summer is now very hot, but not drought-stricken. In any case, it is so for us and it seems to be so also for our European partners. In our recent talks with the leadership of France and Britain we discovered new and interesting signs of understanding of the fact that all of us, all Europeans countries, are capable of acting in a common direction for the establishment of a climate of trust and cooperation on the continent.

Today, in concluding our talks with you, the federal vice chancellor and foreign minister of a major and authoritative state, it is possible to note that they have increased the assets of this important process.

As partners in a dialogue we fully recognize the significance of good relations between our states for the present and future of our people, and for the situation in Europe, and not only there. This can be achieved if we recognize each other as sovereign and equal coauthors of European policy, inspired by the vital interests of those nations that populate the continent. As we see it, the formula "from the Atlantic to the Urals" means not only a natural area of definite measures, but also a realization of the special unity of the European Continent and the common nature of the destinies of its peoples.

What has been said in no way reflects a desire to sever the "European wedge" from the North Atlantic alliance. We believe that with all the links existing within alliances it is necessary to strengthen those threads, the severance of which is fraught with the severance of the whole world fabric.

For us and you, these threads lie in Europe, this unique center of achievements of human civilization, and, to our common misfortune, concentration of troops and weapons. Great works of culture coexist here with the sinister contours of other installations; and while the first symbolizes the triumph of the human spirit, the second threatens its immortality.

One must put an end to this unnatural coexistence. It is at this that the Soviet Union's proposals to clear Europe of nuclear weapons -- both intermediate range and tactical -- are aimed. I remind you that this is only part of our plan for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Together with the other Warsaw Pact states we also favor deep cuts in armaments and armed forces on the European Continent, combined with measures that would exclude the possibility of a sudden attack.

We are counting on the most active participation of the FRG Government in solving these important questions.

It is understandable that there be large differences between East and West, Eduard Shevardnadze went on, and it would be unreasonable to pretend that there are not, or that we can remove them by waving some magic wand. But we will never reduce the zone of these differences if we do not learn to respect each other's legitimate interests.

This is the approach through which a successful conclusion to the Stockholm conference and a dynamic and constructive holding of the Vienna meeting of member countries of the European conference is possible.

Contacts with the French leadership, talks in London and conversations with representatives of other countries have confirmed that this is realistic, and that we have a common interest in it.

I assure you that the USSR is ready to cooperate in an honest and sincere manner with all states, naturally including the Federal Republic, so as to strengthen trust and mutual understanding. We have concrete compromise options and we hope for a positive reaction from our partners in Stockholm and at other forums.

The solution of a truly historic task -- to completely ban and eliminate one of the most barbaric means of destruction, chemical weapons -- is also something that is

practicable. If the Western side shows an accommodating readiness for compromise in this area as well, it would be possible to complete the working out of a relevant convention and to sign it.

Humanity has grown tired of the rhetoric, and no longer sees it as a way out of the stalemate. Actions are needed, large-scale, serious actions capable of clearing away the obstacles. Any meetings, including summit meetings, should conclude with practical results. This is our approach to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. I will say that on our initiative an accord was reached with the U.S. side on holding a meeting of experts on banning nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet Union has also proposed convening a special session of the Soviet-U.S. permanent consultative commission, which will discuss questions connected with the SALT-II treaty. In this context, we note with satisfaction the statements made by the FRG Government on the need to observe this treaty.

Unfortunately, the Federal Republic's joining of the U.S. "star wars" program contradicts this position, and this devalues its positive statements.

The Soviet Union believes that the creation of a security system, based to an increasing degree on political, economic, legal and moral guarantees, would be in keeping with the interests of all people.

I hope that we will not only encounter sufficient understanding in this on the part of our Western partners, but that we will also act quickly and energetically: parallel in some aspects, and in others, possibly jointly.

We must begin to work seriously and in a businesslike fashion for peace, for the future.

If we are able to lay the foundation for this, it will be the best result of our talks. Allow me to express hope that this is how it will be. Of course, it is more pleasant to talk about positive events in the present tense. I link these events with the signing of general agreement on scientific and technological cooperation and the initialling of specialized agreements on cooperation in the sphere of agriculture, health care and peaceful use of nuclear power. Their implementation will undoubtedly become advantageous for both sides and will stimulate our contacts in the sphere of peaceful creation.

I think we have grounds for greeting each other on this and to wish new successes in deepening businesslike partnership.

In conclusion, Eduard Shevardnadze wished Hans-Dietrich Genscher and his entourage health, peace and happiness and also prosperity to the peoples of both countries.

In his speech, Hans Dietrich Genscher gave thanks on his own behalf and on behalf of the people accompanying him for the hospitality they were shown.

The meetings between the foreign ministers of our countries are a constant feature of the bilateral political dialogue, which has never been interrupted, even in difficult times, he said.

I share the opinion of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the opinion of the USSR foreign minister that the significance of the conversations that have taken place between us in Moscow go beyond the framework of an ordinary visit. They have certainly contributed to a better understanding of each other's positions, including opposing ones. I am also of the opinion that, without forgetting the past, we should now open a new page in the development of German-Soviet relations.

Like you, we shall reflect on how to make more active the dialogue and cooperation between our states and on what contribution we can make, acting jointly and in parallel, to the cause of reducing the problems and dangers burdening the international situation.

The time is ripe for principled decisions between East and West. We see a realistic possibility of achieving a turn for the better in East-West relations through achieving results at the conference table. The Federal Government is assisting in all possible ways the improvement of East-West relations.

Despite the different social systems of the European states, the guest continued, we need to consider it our common task to preserve the consciousness of the rich joint cultural heritage and support this consciousness with the implementation of a varied exchange. The European states are mutually connected with complementary economic structures. We welcome the establishment of contacts both between the European Community and CEMA and between the European Community and CEMA member-states.

It is not fortuitous that we on both sides are embarking on the development of political concepts for the longer term, lifting our gaze to the frontier of the next century. It is important to give these concepts a broad foundation.

The foreign ministers of the member-states of the North Atlantic alliance announced in Halifax that their objective was a principled improvement in East-West relations which should acquire a new qualitative level and which should, by their higher level of trust, openness and security, be of benefit to all. We fully support the objective of the talks agreed upon 8 January 1985 and reaffirmed at the Geneva summit: the prevention of an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth. At the conference table this objective should, finally, be reflected in specific accords. Both sides must make their contribution to this and no one should bank on procrastination.

We are of the same opinion concerning our evaluation of the significance of further verification of conventional weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals: both sides have declared -- in Halifax and in Budapest -- their principled readiness for this. But first it is essential to achieve a real result at Stockholm, at the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. In the last few days in Stockholm both sides have taken approving steps.

We have taken cognizance with interest of the declarations of the Soviet leadership regarding the necessity of effective verification of understandings on disarmament. We welcome the constructive elements they contain. It is also essential to use what has been attained in arms control policy; this relates to the observance of limits provided for by SALT-2 as well as to the observance of the ABM treaty.

We share the idea expressed not long ago by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, that people do not wish to reconcile themselves to arbitrariness and lawlessness. The observance of human rights must be a fundamental task and the mark of every state.

Concerning the role of states that play a special role in the situation of regional conflicts, he said: Grounds for concern are given by the situation in the Near East, Indochina, Central America and southern Africa. A political solution is required in Afghanistan today more than ever before. It is essential to avoid burdening the international situation as a result of processes that are to be observed in the Third World.

Highly appraising the agreements signed during the visit, Hans-Dietrich Genscher stressed that the FRG is also ready to develop new forms of cooperation in economic collaboration. He advocated that the Soviet side again, in greater volume, grant the opportunity for the emigration of Germans from the Soviet Union.

Our meeting, the guest noted, serves to explain our policy to one another more intelligibly. We regard dialogue as essential for the strengthening of confidence between our countries, despite a number of existing divergences in opinions and interests or, perhaps, precisely on account of that. In keeping with this, we are ready for an intensification of political dialogue, which plays an important role, if we wish to make our contribution to the building of a common European home, which should be a home with doors open both from inside and outside.

It is important to lay a new foundation for the formation of relations between our countries. We have not yet laid it but are in the process of doing it.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher wished Mikhail Gorbachev and the USSR foreign minister good health, and prosperity to all Soviet citizens. He pronounced himself in favor of good relations between the FRG and the USSR, for peace in Europe and the whole world.

DPA Reports Genscher Speech

LD220927 Hamburg DPA in German 0852 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, 22 Jul (DPA)--Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher affirmed in Moscow today the wish for better relations between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union. During the dinner given by his Soviet counterpart, Eduard Shevardnadze, Genscher said a new page should be opened in the development of German-Soviet relations.

A new foundation has not been laid so far "but we are in the process of laying it," Genscher said. Bonn, just like Moscow, will reflect on how the dialogue and cooperation could be shaped still more actively and what common contribution could be made by the two sides toward reducing the problems and dangers straining the international situation.

Genscher said the Federal Government is working wholeheartedly for a lasting improvement in East-West relations. Bonn sees a realistic possibility that the relations could change for the better through success at the various East-West negotiations and through resolute efforts to improve the political situation. At the same time Genscher made it clear that the Federal Government is steadfast [kein wanderer zwischen den welten]. It is an active member of the EC and NATO and endorses the principles of the Western world.

He also stated that he sees his task as being one to stress Bonn's interest in a second Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Such a meeting, which should naturally bring about perceptible progress, is very important, Genscher said.

One concludes from all this that the FRG foreign minister has arrived in Moscow with the intention of promoting a solution of urgent international problems and the development of Soviet-West German relations. Such an intention can only be welcomed. I do not think it is superfluous to recall that Genscher has given a positive assessment of the latest Soviet peace initiatives, in particular the proposal for a substantial reduction in armed forces and weapons on the European Continent; he said it would be incorrect to regard these proposals as propaganda.

However, words alone are not enough to give a genuine stimulus to the process of disarmament in Europe or to promote an improvement in the international situation. The FRG's actions up to now have gone in the opposite direction. Suffice it to recall that Bonn was one of the first to actively support the Reagan star wars program, which is fraught with a serious threat to the cause of peace.

The question of responsibility for the destiny of the world acutely faces every state. The Soviet Union sincerely strives toward constructive and fruitful dialogue with all states, including the FRG. I think that this will determine our country's position during the negotiations that are beginning with FRG Foreign Minister Genscher.

Politburo Discusses Visit

LD241716 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Excerpts] At a 24 July session the CPSU Central Committee Politburo considered the work of the KOMMUNIST journal.

A report from Comrades Gorbachev and Shevardnadze on the results of talks with Federal Vice Chancellor and FRG Foreign Minister Genscher was heard. Noted was the positive significance of the exchange of views which took place and which revealed opportunities for political dialogue and businesslike cooperation between the USSR and FRG in various spheres. As a major West European state, the FRG bears its share of responsibility for the situation in Europe and could play an important role in improving the international situation and resolving matters relating to the limitation and reduction of armaments and the strengthening of security on the continent.

It was stressed that the USSR is prepared to cooperate with it in these areas without prejudice to the allied obligations of the two sides. It is important to secure a heightening of Europe's role in international affairs, without which serious steps forward cannot be taken or the way paved toward a more secure future.

It was noted at the same time that the policies of the FRG Government regrettably continue in many respects to bear the stamp of the past, which does not meet the requirements of the new political thinking in the nuclear space age. Statements in favor of a responsible view of the present-day world should be backed up by real and practical actions to maintain reliable security for the peoples of our common European home. This would correspond both to the FRG's own interests and to an improvement of relations between the USSR and the FRG, and between Eastern and Western Europe.

Commentary on Visit

LD222003 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1641 GMT 22 Jul 86

[Viktor Levin commentary on FRG Foreign Minister Genscher's visit to the USSR; from the "International Diary" program presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Text] The FRG is one of the largest European states, and moreover, the largest trading partner of our country among the capitalist countries. If one recalls that the FRG is in the center of Europe, and directly borders the socialist states of the GDR and Czechoslovakia, it becomes clear that the FRG plays an important role in the life of our continent.

Concerning the problems Europe is currently encountering, I would first and foremost like to say that in conditions when the international political climate leaves much to be desired and the world situation remains alarming, when the United States not only does not show any readiness to reach an agreement on issues connected with disarmament, but also follows a course directed at undermining existing agreements, all European states are faced with the task of vigorously searching for ways of reviving detente. Nowhere in the world is there such a concentration of weapons and armed forces as in Europe. Nowhere in the world is there such a tense confrontation as in Europe. Consequently, to relieve the situation in Europe would mean to improve the political climate both on the continent and throughout the world. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are firmly convinced that Europe can and must make its contribution to the formation of new political thought, to the solution of problems of significance for all of mankind. The Soviet Union is acting in this direction.

The present visit to Moscow by Foreign Minister Genscher is by no means the only testimony of this. Remember, in early July our country was visited by French President Mitterrand. Then a visit was made to London by the Soviet foreign minister. Now there is a meeting with the head of the foreign policy department of the FRG.

No one is shutting his eyes to the problems that divide us. But it is important that with every meeting it is possible to move forward both on the level of bilateral relations and in improving the political climate. As DPA reported, the message from Chancellor Kohl to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, with Genscher handed to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, expresses the FRG's readiness to strengthen dialogue with Moscow and improve relations in all areas. Very good. The job will not stop because of us. But it must be noted that similar assurances were made before too, and in practice the FRG is supporting the warlike course of the U.S. Administration. Dialogue is useful, more than that, it is essential. But I would like to remind you that it must be not conversation for the sake of conversation, it must be constructive and productive.

The visit by the FRG foreign minister to Moscow can be counted among the assets of both the Soviet Union and the FRG. But the possibilities that exist for the development of bilateral relations and for joint actions in favor of the consolidation of peace, have, of course not been exhausted by it. And the more vigorously these possibilities are realized, the better it will be for our countries and for the world as a whole.

Genscher's U.S. Visit

LD242336 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] Genscher, FRG vice chancellor and minister of foreign affairs, paid a brief visit to Washington to inform U.S. Secretary of State Shultz about the results of his recent talks in Moscow. Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver comments on this report:

[Zholkver] The transoceanic lightning visit by the head of the Bonn foreign policy department does not cause special surprise if one takes into account that Bonn is usually called the first pupil in the Atlantic class. It is also interesting that this time the Bonn minister publicly urged his U.S. colleague to at last give a serious answer to Soviet proposals on disarmament questions. Of course it is difficult as yet to say what the motives are in this case for the not altogether usual act by Bonn -- the beginning of new political thinking or tactical reasons connected with the forthcoming parliamentary elections in the FRG.

The West German Social Democrats, for example, consider that shuttle diplomacy is not a substitute for progress on the gist of the problem, pointing out that up until now any initiative on disarmament has failed as a result of resistance in the ranks of the CDU/CSU. But as they say, better late than never. This is more true in this case as Bonn would only be joining the general European process that is proceeding apace. I have in mind that in many countries of Western Europe there has recently been a growing understanding of the need for energetic actions to avert the threat of nuclear war. For example, Paris's LE MONDE considers, not without grounds, that the recent Soviet-French summit talks have had a positive influence on the course of the Stockholm conference. I recall that the ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR and Great Britain also spoke out recently in favor of a successful ending to that forum, which is so important cause of peace. In the same period the Norwegian delegation at the Geneva conference on disarmament came out with a notable initiative for creating an all-European system for monitoring a nuclear weapons test ban. So, every country, small and large, including of course the FRG, can contribute to the formation of new political thinking and to improving the general situation.

Of course the contribution of such a power as the United States would be especially weighty. However, Pentagon chief Weinberger, merely timed his latest, and this time particularly sharp, speech, against any, as he put it, compromises on questions concerned with disarmament to coincide with the visit of the West German minister of foreign affairs. To judge from everything, the buds of new political thinking are forcing their way through, across the ocean, with particularly great difficulty.

FRG CP Aide Comments

LD241618 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 24 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn July 24 TASS -- The German Communist Party has urged the FRG Government to intensify efforts in the interests of disarmament. Touching upon the visit to Moscow of Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG minister for foreign affairs, Hermann Gautier, member of the Presidium of the board of the German Communist Party, evaluated as a positive fact that the FRG minister had again reaffirmed Bonn's commitment to the principles of the Moscow Treaty of 1970 and the Helsinki Final Act. It must be also welcomed, H. Gautier pointed out in a statement issued here, that the FRG Government, unlike the extremists in the Washington administration, favours a further observance of the treaties on the limitation of strategic weapons.

At the same time, he criticised Genscher for not bringing along to Moscow any constructive proposals in the field of disarmament.

It is necessary in the interests of the FRG, Hermann Gautier, member of the Presidium of the board of the German Communist Party, stressed that the government should start, at last, pursuing a new policy in the field of international security. It should insist that Washington end nuclear weapons testing. Bonn should cancel the accord with the USA on the FRG's participation in the implementation of the SDI, demand that U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles be withdrawn from West German territory and respond constructively to the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty countries on a cut in conventional weapons, Hermann Gautier emphasised.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1496

END